THE ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF ZION AS A THEOLOGICAL SYMBOL IN ANCIENT ISRAEL

by

David Lemoine Eiler

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY

Princeton, New Jersey

1968

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My first word of appreciation belongs to the two men who together have guided the writing of this dissertation, to Dr. R. B. Y. Scott of Princeton University who suggested the topic and served as primary advisor, and to Dr. Charles T. Fritsch of Princeton Theological Seminary who coordinated the dissertation committee and smoothed the path of doctoral studies and dissertation writing in ways too numerous to mention. Both men read each section of material as it was submitted, offering thoughtful suggestions, criticisms and encouragement in just the right measure and balance.

I am also indebted to many other faculty members in the Department of Biblical Studies at Princeton Theological Seminary under whom I was privileged to study. Although this indebtedness cannot be spelled out in detail, four men must be mentioned whose lectures and seminars contributed in special ways to my preparation for writing this dissertation. Dr. Otto A. Piper, who first introduced me to the history and varied disciplines of biblical scholarship, impressed upon me the importance of examining the theological and philosophical assumptions and implications of each hermeneutical method. Dr. Henry S. Gehman imparted to me an enduring love for the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint and a joy in wrestling directly with the texts themselves. From the standpoint of Palestinian archaeology Dr. G. A. Barrois gave me a vivid and unforgettable picture of the history and topography of Jerusalem in ancient times. During two terms as guest professor at Princeton Theological Seminary, Dr. Gerhard von Rad of Heidelberg influenced my understanding of the

Old Testament in numerous ways that are evident throughout this dissertation.

Writing a dissertation of this kind in the middle of Kansas, hundreds of miles from any theological library, would have been impossible without the help of two people who went far beyond the call of duty to provide resource materials when requested. These were Miss Elizabeth L. Crawford, Circulation Librarian of Speer Library, Princeton Theological Seminary, and Miss Virginia Harris, Head Librarian of Beeghly Library, McPherson College.

My deepest gratitude is to my family. First of all I am grateful to my wife, Ruth, who has supported with patience years of study and writing which had to be interspersed with a heavy teaching schedule, often at the sacrifice of family activities. Beyond this she has painstakingly typed all the material numerous times. Last I must mention my daughters, Janis and Lois, who have also learned the meaning of patience since they can hardly remember a time when daddy was not working on his dissertation.

McPherson, Kansas, March 1968

CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

ABBREVIATIONS viii

INTRODUCTION 1

- A. Wellhausen 1
- B. The "religionsgeschichtlich" Approach 5
- C. Alt, Noth, von Rad and the Study of Israel's Distinctive Traditions 15
- D. Recent Studies 18
- E. The Methods and Aims of This Study 22

I. TRADITIONS OF PREMONARCHIC ORIGIN CONCERNING THE ARK AND CHERUBIM 25

- A. The Ark in the Yahwistic Stratum of the Pentateuch 25
- B. The Ark in Joshua and Judges 30
- C. The Ark in Samuel 35
- D. The Ark and the Divine Title "Yahweh Sabaoth" 41
- E. The Storm Theophany and Throne Symbolism of the Cherubim 45
- F. The Ark and the Jerusalem "Name" Theology 52
- G. The Shiloh Ark Cult as Reflected in the Priestly Ark and Tabernacle Tradition 53
- H. Summary 58

II. THE ARK AND THE CULTIC ESTABLISHMENTS OF DAVID AND SOLOMON ACCORDING TO THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL AND KINGS 62

- A. The Shiloh Priestly Family and David's Rise to Power 63
- B. The Ark and David's Holy War Victories 65
- C. The Establishment of the Ark Cult at Zion by David 68

D. The Transferral of the Zion Ark Cult to the Solomonic Temple 70

E. The Ark and Nathan's Dynastic Oracle 75

F. The Sacred Legend of the Temple Site 82

G. Summary 84

III. THE ETYMOLOGY, TOPOGRAPHICAL REFERENCE AND LITERARY DISTRIBUTION OF ZION AND RELATED TERMS 86

A. Origin of the Words Zion and Jerusalem 86

B. The Topographical Reference of the Words Zion and Jerusalem 90

C. The Distribution of the Terms Zion and Jerusalem 97

D. Summary 104

IV. THE ARK AS A HOLY WAR SYMBOL AND THE KINGSHIP OF YAHWEH AT ZION IN THE PSALMS 106

A. The Ark and the Holy War Theophany Tradition in Psalm 68 107

B. Genesis 14:17-24 and the Canaanite Elyon Tradition 117

C. The Assimilation of Elyon Themes in Psalm 82 and Deuteronomy 32 121

D. Elyon Themes and the Holy War Symbolism of the Ark in Exodus 15:1b-18 125

E. Elyon Themes and the Ark in the Psalms of Yahweh's Kingship: Psalms 97 and 47 130

F. The Ark and Cherubim as Holy War Theophany Symbols in the Psalms of Yahweh's Kingship: Psalms 99, 93, 29, 96 135

G. The Holy War Symbolism of the Ark Procession: Psalms 24, 80 142

H. Summary 146

V. ZION, THE ARK, AND THE DAVIDIC DYNASTY IN THE ROYAL PSALMS 149

A. The Ark and the Election of Zion and David in Psalms 132 and 78 150

B. The Ark at Zion and the Davidic Empire Theology in Psalm 110 157

C. Zion and the Davidic Empire Theology in Psalm 2 167

D. The King and the Holy War Theophany Symbolism of the Ark in Psalm 18 172

E. The Ark as the Symbol of Royal Victory in Psalm 21 178

F. Yahweh's Name at Zion as the Source of Royal Victory in Psalm 20 182

G. Summary 185

VI. ZION AS A THEOLOGICAL SYMBOL IN THE SONGS OF ZION 188

A. Zion as a Holy War Theophany Symbol in Psalm 76 188

B. The Mythical Titles of Honor for Zion in Psalm 48:2-4 193

C. The Holy War Symbolism of Zion in Psalm 48:5-15 204

D. Zion as a Symbol of Security in Yahweh in Psalm 46 209

E. Elements of Zion Symbolism in Psalms 50, 65, 84, 122, 149 219

F. Summary 221

VII. ZION AS A SYMBOL OF FAITH FOR ISAIAH 225

A. Zion Symbolism in Isaiah's Call Vision and Yahweh's Holy War Action against Israel 226

B. Isaiah's Concept of Trust and His First Confrontation with Ahaz, Isaiah 7:1-9 231

C. The Relation of the Immanuel Sign to the David and Zion Traditions, Isaiah 7:10-17 237

D. Hezekiah's Reform and Isaiah's Renewal of the Demand for Trust, Isaiah 14:28-32 244

E. Oracles on Yahweh's Defense of Zion in the Stories of Sennacherib's Invasion 249

F. Yahweh's Theophany Defense of Zion, Isaiah 31:4-5,8-9; 30:27-33; and 10:24-27c 257

G. The Theophany Tradition and the Deliverance of Ariel, Isaiah 29:1-8 263

H. Summary 269

VIII. THE DECLINE OF ZION AS A THEOLOGICAL SYMBOL IN THE LAST CENTURY OF THE JUDEAN MONARCHY 274

A. Zion and the Deuteronomic Reform Theology 275

B. Zion as a Symbol of Judgment in Micah and Zephaniah 278

C. Jeremiah's Rejection of Zion Deliverance Traditions 282

D. The Failure of Zion as a Symbol of Deliverance in Lamentations 286

E. Ezekiel's Reinterpretation of the Cosmic Enthronement Symbolism of the Ark and Cherubim 289

F. Summary 292

IX. THE DEVELOPMENT OF ZION AS AN ESCHATOLOGICAL SYMBOL 294

A. Zion as an Eschatological Symbol in Isaiah 2:2-4 and Micah 4:1-4 295

B. Zion as an Eschatological Symbol in Deutero-Isaiah 299

C. The Dependence of the Jerusalem Restoration Prophets on Deutero-Isaiah 309

D. Exilic Survivals of the Zion Holy War Deliverance Tradition 313

E. The Attack of the Nations and Yahweh's Eschatological Victory at Zion 315

F. Zion as a Proto-Apocalyptic Symbol in the Latest Strata of the Book of Isaiah 321

G. Summary 326

CONCLUSION 330

BIBLIOGRAPHY 339

A. Primary Sources and Linguistic Aids 339

B. Secondary Sources 340

ABBREVIATIONS

ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
ANET	J. B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (2d ed., Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955)
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BDB	F. Brown, S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic* (London: Oxford University Press, 1907)
BH	R. Kittel, ed., *Biblia Hebraica*, 7th ed. by A. Alt and O. Eissfeldt (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Würtembergische Bibelanstalt, 1951)
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GB	F. Buhl, *Wilhelm Gesenius' hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (17. Aufl., Berlin/Göttingen/Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1915)
GK	E. Kautzsch, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 2d English ed. rev., tr. A. E. Cowley (London: Oxford University Press, 1910)
GS	M. Noth, *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (2. Aufl., München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1960)
GS	G. von Rad, *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (2. Aufl., München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1960)
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
IB	G. A. Buttrick, ed., *The Interpreter's Bible* (12 vols.; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1951-1957)
ICC	The International Critical Commentary
IDB	G. A. Buttrick, ed., *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (4 vols.; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962)
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
KAI	H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften* (3 Bde.; Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1962-1964)
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament

KB	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1951)
KS	A. Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Bde. 1-2, 2. Aufl.; Bd. 3, 1. Aufl.; München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959)
KS	O. Eissfeldt, *Kleine Schriften*, ed. R. Sellheim and F. Maas (3 Bde.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1962-1966)
LBC	The Laymen's Bible Commentary
LXX	Septuagint text of the Greek Old Testament cited according to A. Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta* (2 Bde., Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935), and H. B. Swete, ed., *The Old Testament in Greek* (3 vols.; 2d ed., Cambridge: The University Press, 1895-1899)
MT	Masoretic Text of the Hebrew Bible cited according to *BH*
OAB	H. G. May and B. M. Metzger, eds., *The Oxford Annotated Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962)
PCB	M. Black and H. H. Rowley, eds., *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962)
RSV	The Revised Standard Version of the Bible cited according to *OAB*
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SVT	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
TBC	Torch Bible Commentaries
TWNT	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (8 Bde.; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1933ff.)
UM	C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Manual* (Analecta Orientalia, 35, 3 vols.; rev. ed., Roma: Pontificum Institutum Biblicum, 1955)
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZB	Zürcher Bibelkommentare

INTRODUCTION

Jerusalem is a city sacred to three religions, Judaism, Christianity and Islam. For nearly three thousand years it has played a distinctive though often changing role in middle eastern and European religious, cultural, and political history. As Alt has shown, the enduring significance of Jerusalem cannot be explained historically in terms of its natural geographical location or its inherent economic and political importance.[1] Down through the centuries its significance has derived from its function as a religious symbol. In turn, the subsequent history of Jerusalem as a religious symbol cannot be explained apart from the accomplishments of David and Solomon in making it the political and religious capital of the short-lived Israelite empire during the tenth century B. C. The purpose of this study is twofold. First, it aims to investigate the process whereby Jerusalem or, to use its more sacred synonym, Zion became a distinctive religious and theological symbol during the time of David and Solomon. Then it seeks to trace the evolution of Zion's symbolic role through the rest of the Old Testament period.

A. Wellhausen

The investigation of almost any major Old Testament theme must begin with the creative synthesis of Old Testament religious and literary history presented by Julius Wellhausen in his *Prolegomena zur Geschichte*

---

[1] A. Alt, "Jerusalems Aufsteig" (1925), *KS*, III, 242-257.

Israels, first published in 1883.[1] Wellhausen's primary aim was to present a definitive statement of the evidence for the sequential dating of the various strata of the Pentateuch by correlating them with the history of Israel's religious institutions. The most important fixed point in his scheme was the centralization of the cult at Jerusalem in the religious reform of Josiah, based on Deuteronomy.[2] He did not study the religious symbolism of Zion as such. Nevertheless, his reconstruction of Israelite-Jewish religious history points to Jerusalem as having a unique symbolic significance. Through a unilinear, internal evolutionary and historical development Zion gradually emerged as the symbol of Jewish ethical monotheism which located the center of Yahweh's monarchical sovereignty and holiness in the temple at Jerusalem and its theocratic institutions. The oneness of Zion corresponded to the oneness of Yahweh and the absoluteness of his sovereignty.

The main stages in this development may be summarized in terms of the emergence of Zion's unique religious meaning. Originally the idea of Yahweh's sovereignty was purely an ideal lacking institutional embodiment but recognized in Yahweh's ownership of the land of Palestine and his control over nature as experienced in the growth of crops and flocks and celebrated at the many local sanctuaries.[1] The establishment of the Davidic monarchy as a natural theocratic institution centering in Jerusalem laid the basis for the emergence of Zion as the symbol of Yahweh's sovereignty.[2] Partly as a response to the fall of the Northern Kingdom, Isaiah projected the theocratic ideal of the Davidic monarchy into the future in terms of Zion as the seat of Yahweh's rule of law which would be embodied in a perfect Davidic king or messiah.[3] Deuteronomy first codified the ethical monotheism of the prophets into a covenant law which made centralization of worship at Jerusalem a divinely prescribed expression of the theocratic idea.[4] Ezekiel's program of restoration set Jerusalem apart as a divinely designated sacred territory administered by a priestly hierarchy in order to guarantee the purity and holiness of the temple and its cultus as theocratic institutions.[5] The postexilic prophets indulged in fanciful eschatological speculations in which Zion was expected to be established in a miraculous way as the center of a world empire embodying Yahweh's universal sovereighty.[6] By means of the fiction of the Mosaic tabernacle the Priestly Code made the Jerusalem temple and its artificial priestly institutions into a theocratic embodiment of Yahweh's sovereignty and holiness revealed and established unchangeably for all time to come at Mt. Sinai.[1]

---

[1] Cited here according to the translation, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, tr. J. S. Black and A. Menzies (Edinburgh: 1885), as reprinted under the title, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (New York: Meridian Books, 1957). For summaries of Wellhausen's method and evaluations of his significance see H. F. Hahn, *The Old Testament in Modern Research* (London: SCM Press, 1956), pp. 11-17, 85-87; H. J. Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart* (Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1956), pp. 235-249; R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, tr. J. McHugh (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961), pp. 424-432, and E. G. Kraeling, *The Old Testament Since the Reformation* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1955), pp. 94-95.

[2] *Prolegomena*, pp. 23-28, 32-38, 76-79, 104-108, 141-145, 374-376, 402-404, 417-419.

---

[1] Prolegomena, pp. 17-22, 76-82, 89-92, 127-131, 141, 411-412.

[2] Ibid., pp. 19-22, 131-139, 411-414.

[3] Ibid., pp. 23-26, 414-419.

[4] Ibid., pp. 26-28, 32-34, 90-92, 124, 418-419.

[5] Ibid., pp. 59-60, 122-124, 162-163, 419-422.

[6] Ibid., p. 419; cf. p. 28.

Wellhausen's scheme seems to imply a semi-Hegelian triadic development of the theocratic religious idea as related to Zion.[2] Thesis: Zion first emerged as the center of the Davidic monarchy, a completely natural human institution thought of as mediating Yahweh's sovereignty and blessings. Antithesis: The prophets reinterpreted Yahweh's sovereignty and blessings by making them dependent upon moral conditions and demands but relegated their actualization to an eschatological future centering in Zion. Synthesis: In order to guarantee the fulfillment of the eschatological hopes, the priests embodied both moral and cultic demands in a legalistic priestly theocracy centered in Zion as a holy area artificially set apart from all secular or natural functions.

Scholarly work since the days of Wellhausen has gradually shown that this scheme was overly simplified, arbitrary or defective at many points. His Hegelianism led him to fit everything too neatly into a simple evolutionary pattern of religious development in terms of the emergence and institutional embodiment of the idea of theocracy and ethical monotheism. His romanticism led him to interpret the early stages of Israelite culture and religion in terms of simplicity and naturalness and the later stages in terms of artificiality and complexity.[3] His relative lack of knowledge concerning the ancient cultures of Mesopotamia and Egypt reinforced this tendency since he viewed early Israelite culture as emerging entirely out of the synthesis of a primitive Arab-like nomadic culture with a simple Canaanite peasant culture and then evolving purely on the basis of internal developments.[1]

---

[1] Prolegomena, pp. 34-53, 69-82, 99-112, 145-151, 404-410, 419-425.

[2] Cf. Kraus, Geschichte, p. 244.

[3] Ibid., p. 248, and Hahn, The Old Testament, pp. 12, 15-16.

Despite these weaknesses several aspects of Wellhausen's work continue to be important for any study of the religious significance of Zion. One is his emphasis upon the crucial role of the centralization of the cult of Jerusalem, though one may reconstruct and interpret the process and its significance differently than he did. The factors which enabled a town of no significance for the Israelites at all until the time of David to attain solitary pre-eminence as the cult center of Judaism must be much the same factors that contributed to the meaning of Zion as a religious symbol. The most important of these factors were the differing yet closely related roles of Jerusalem as the seat of the Davidic dynasty and the place of the Solomonic temple and, along with these, the distinctive influence of the Jerusalem prophets.

B. The "religionsgeschichtlich" Approach

The next major development in Old Testament scholarship after the days of Wellhausen was really a combined product of two distinct disciplines. One of these new disciplines applied to Old Testament studies the new knowledge of Mesopotamian and Egyptian culture made available by the archaeological discoveries of the nineteenth century. This gave rise during the first two decades of the twentieth century to the work of the so-called "pan-Babylonian" school, which argued that long before the time of the Israelites Babylonian culture and a general Babylonian mythological *Weltanschauung* dominated the entire Ancient Near East including culture with a simple Canaanite peasant culture and then evolving purely on the basis of internal developments.[1]

---

[1] Cf. Hahn, *The Old Testament*, pp. 86-87.

Despite these weaknesses several aspects of Wellhausen's work continue to be important for any study of the religious significance of Zion. One is his emphasis upon the crucial role of the centralization of the cult of Jerusalem, though one may reconstruct and interpret the process and its significance differently than he did. The factors which enabled a town of no significance for the Israelites at all until the time of David to attain solitary pre-eminence as the cult center of Judaism must be much the same factors that contributed to the meaning of Zion as a religious symbol. The most important of these factors were the differing yet closely related roles of Jerusalem as the seat of the Davidic dynasty and the place of the Solomonic temple and, along with these, the distinctive influence of the Jerusalem prophets.

B. The "religionsgeschichtlich" Approach

The next major development in Old Testament scholarship after the days of Wellhausen was really a combined product of two distinct disciplines. One of these new disciplines applied to Old Testament studies the new knowledge of Mesopotamian and Egyptian culture made available by the archaeological discoveries of the nineteenth century. This gave rise during the first two decades of the twentieth century to the work of the so-called "pan-Babylonian" school, which argued that long before the time of the Israelites Babylonian culture and a general Babylonian mythological *Weltanschauung* dominated the entire Ancient Near East including

---

[1] Cf. Hahn, *The Old Testament*, pp. 86-87.

Palestine.[1] All kinds of supposed correspondences between the Bible and the cuneiform documents were brought forward as evidence that Israelite culture and religion are intelligible only when interpreted as derivatives of Babylonian culture and mythology.

The other major new factor in Old Testament studies in the first two decades of the twentieth century was the development by Hermann Gunkel of form or tradition criticism as a scholarly method.[2] Like the advocates of pan-Babylonian theories, Gunkel felt it necessary to relate Israelite religious ideas to Babylonian antecedents. Thus the interpreter of the Old Testament must discover wherever possible the Babylonian or other pre-Israelite origins of an Israelite conceptual motif or religious theme. But, unlike the pan-Babylonian school, Gunkel was impressed by the religious creativity of the Israelites and the aesthetic greatness of their literature. According to him, therefore, the main task of the interpreter is to reconstruct the process whereby the Israelites continually reworked in new and creative ways their own folk traditions and traditions appropriated from other peoples.[3] The methods of both Gunkel and the pan-Babylonians may thus be labelled *religionsgeschichtlich* in a general sense. Yet the results were quite different. Whereas the pan-Babylonians emphasized common origins and across-the-board similarities in such a way as to minimize religious development and deny Israelite distinctiveness, Gunkel emphasized the continuing history of religious and literary themes in terms of the tendency of Israelite religion to undergo independent internal development and become distinctive. In this respect he was closer to Wellhausen.

---

[1] See Kraus, *Geschichte*, pp. 265-283, Kraeling, *The Old Testament*, pp. 96-97, 149-163, and Hahn, *The Old Testament*, pp. 87-91.

[2] Kraus, *Geschichte*, pp. 301-305, 308-334, and Hahn, *The Old Testament*, pp. 86, 91-93, 96, 119-128, 137-138.

[3] Gunkel's first influential work, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895), treated the biblical theme of creation in this manner.

The first scholar to adopt and make further use of Gunkel's methods was Hugo Gressmann.[1] His last major work, Der Messias, focuses primarily upon the origin and development of messianic eschatology in the Old Testament.[2] The basic framework of Gressmann's interpretation of the development of Israelite eschatology is Gunkel's Urzeit-Endzeit scheme.[3] According to this view, myths of Babylonian or other non-Israelite origin concerning the creation battle against the chaos dragon, the primeval paradise and the lost golden age of the past were current among the Israelites and furnished the basis for the creation, paradise and other related themes in the Old Testament. But these same mythical themes projected into the future provided the material for the eschatological ideas of the prophets and apocalyptists. By partially historicizing and localizing these themes the Israelites, especially the prophets, assimilated them to their own ethical-religious ideals. Zion was one of several symbolic focal points around which such historical and geographical particularization took place.

This assimilation was carried out with unusual success in the case of the Völkerorakel such as Isaiah 28:14-22; 29:1-8; 30:27-35; Ezekiel

---

[1] For somewhat fragmentary accounts of his work see Kraus, Geschichte, pp. 298-299, 305-308, 360-362, 414, and Hahn, The Old Testament, pp. 93-94, 125-126, 130-131.

[2] H. Gressmann, Der Messias, ed. H. Schmidt (FRLANT, 43; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1929).

[3] See for example his statements in Der Messias, pp. 151-152. This view was first worked out by H. Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos, and is mentioned in summary form in his commentary, Genesis übersetzt und erklärt (HKAT, I:1; 3. Aufl., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), pp. 28-40, 116-130, in connection with his interpretation of Genesis 1-3.

38-39; and Joel 1:1-2:17. These depicted the *Endzeit* in terms of a great attack upon Jerusalem by foreign enemies.[1] But at the last moment Yahweh destroys them and delivers Jerusalem. Thus Zion must pass through a crisis of terror and suffering. But its ultimate destiny is *Heil*, while that of the heathen is *Unheil*.

Gressmann found the ultimate origin of these two themes of the *Völkerorakel* in originally non-Israelite legends and myths such as the Babylonian flood legend and the Tiamat myth which portrayed the *Urzeit* in terms of a world catastrophe of nature climaxing in a great divine victory over the chaos elements and evil powers. Since *Endzeit* was a restoration of *Urzeit*, they could equally well portray a great final world catastrophe. In Israel these themes were first historicized by *Heilspropheten* who stressed the element of deliverance from foreign nations. But *Unheilspropheten* such as Isaiah, Micah and Zephaniah, intensified the element of threat by representing the attack of some particular nation as divine punishment for the sins of Jerusalem and its inhabitants. Then in the postexilic period when Judah no longer had any kind of independent political existence, the theme was dehistoricized and the older mythological ideas reappeared in pure form. The great eschatological events were again portrayed entirely in terms of world catastrophes of nature and coalitions of foreign powers attacking Jerusalem. After the great eschatological turning point (*šûb* *š^{e}bût* = *die* *Wendung* *wenden*) the worship of Yahweh would become universal; Israel or the messiah or Zion would rule the world; primeval paradise would return.

By means of geographical localization and particularization various primeval garden-of-the-gods and golden age themes of Babylonian origin were connected with Zion, such as universal peace among the animals and mankind and the eschatological transformation of nature into a paradise with magical trees and magical food and drink capable of bestowing eternal life and blessedness.[1] All of these varied paradise and golden age themes are connected with Zion primarily by the localization and historization of mythical cosmological and cosmographical ideas concerning the mountain of God, the city of God, and the garden of God which were ultimately Babylonian in origin.[2] The eschatological idea of Zion or Jerusalem becoming the highest mountain in the world (Is. 2:2-4 = Mic. 4:1-4; Zech. 14:10; Ezek. 40:2) and the description which calls it "the end of the north" (*yark^{e}tê ṣāpôn*, Ps. 48:3), both represent transferrals to Zion of the foreign idea that the highest god dwells on the highest mountain in the farthest north.

---

[1] Gressmann, *Der Messias*, pp. 97-148. He also mentions Mic. 4:11-13; Zeph. 3:8-10; Joel 4:9-17; Zech. 12-14; Pss. 48; 76.

The mythological passages in Isaiah 14:12-15 and Ezekiel 28:11-19 provide clues concerning the myth that lies behind these allusions. In the Isaiah passage the myth of the morning star (*hêlēl ben-šaḥar*) being cast down to the underworld after attempting to usurp the place of the high god of heaven (*^{c}elyôn*) in the farthest north (*b^{e}yark^{e}tê ṣāpôn*) probably originated as a Babylonian astral myth mediated to the Israelites by the Canaanites or Amorites. In the original Babylonian form of the myth the dome of the sky itself may have been the mountain and the north pole of the sky where the god Anu lived at the highest point. In a similar way the idea of the river watering the garden of God is applied to Zion as in Psalms 36:9-10; 46:5; 65:10; Isaiah 51:3; Ezekiel 47:1-12;

---

[1] *Der Messias*, pp. 151-158. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 164-181.

Zechariah 13:1; 14:8; Joel 4:18.[1] Thus in Gressmann's view Zion symbolized an almost timeless, transcendent and ideal reality from which historical reality emerged as a kind of fall and to which it will return at the climax of the great cosmic cycle.

The Ugaritic mythological texts published after Gressmann's death have amply confirmed the Canaanite prehistory of the mythical motifs connected with Zion. His account of the content of these themes in terms of mythical cosmographics and primeval creation and conflict traditions is still basically convincing. The greatest weakness of his work is the schematic use of the Urzeit-Endzeit hypothesis as the framework for his interpretation of all eschatological themes including those relating to Zion. If Israelite eschatological thought presupposed such an underlying cosmic necessity, one would expect that Israel's eschatological legends and myths as preserved in the Old Testament would correspond more precisely with the canonical primeval legends of Genesis than they actually do. Gressmann can fit these into the Urzeit-Endzeit scheme only by reconstructing a more highly mythological oral tradition prototype of each passage in such a way as to bring out similar underlying motifs. But, significantly, he admits that there was no full scale Israelite or pre-Israelite Endzeit narrative myth corresponding to the primeval Tiamat and flood narratives.[2] He says instead that eschatological passages used these themes mainly in the form of weakened and partially historicized fragments. Why is this so if there was a determinative underlying framework of thought among the Israelites which regarded it as a cosmic necessity that Urzeit must return as Endzeit? Gressmann is right in seeing that Zion functions as a religious symbol having both cosmological and eschatological dimensions. He correctly sees that Zion is at once both a space symbol and a time symbol. But he fails to recognize clearly enough that the various Canaanite mythological themes he has discovered have undergone a fundamental change in symbolic significance by being "historicized" and attached to Zion. But any treatment of Zion as a theological symbol must explain in some alternative way the significance of the mythological themes which Gressmann has pointed out in connection with Zion.

---

[1] Der Messias, pp. 179-181. [2] Ibid., p. 147.

The various so-called myth-and-ritual theories in Scandinavia and Great Britain have focused primarily on the ritual patterns of the New Year festival and the ritual functions of the king.[1] Mowinckel, the most influential exponent of this approach, has not treated the theme of Zion except as a subordinate element in the myth and ritual pattern. In terms of Zion's symbolic significance he differs with Gressmann only in stressing the relationship between Zion, the king, and the ark as Yahweh's throne symbol.[2]

Since mythological themes of the type considered by Gressmann are widespread they have often been studied from an anthropological standpoint with a view to constructing a general religio-historical theory of religion. An excellent example is the work of Mircea Eliade who attempts to give a universally applicable synthetic description of archaic religions in terms of a few fundamental myth and ritual patterns.[1] Under the general categories of cosmological archetypes or models and periodic rituals of the regeneration of creation and time he brings together a great variety of mythological themes illustrated by examples from many different cultures. He finds a close relationship between cosmological themes such as the navel of the earth, the paradise mountain, the city of the gods, and *Urzeit-Endzeit* ideas on the one hand, and mythically based cultic rituals of renewal on the other. For him, Zion and the temple at Jerusalem constituted such a cosmological symbol of the center, a sacred space symbolizing the universe in miniature and imparting order and reality to the world.[2] Like others who have tried to fit Zion entirely into some universal religio-historical category, Eliade uses Old Testament passages, later apocalyptic texts and rabbinical materials indiscriminately and without distinction, regardless of date. But he argues elsewhere that the Israelite evaluation of historical events as revelation, together with the messianic eschatology of the prophets, represented a fundamental break with mythological ideas of the endless cyclical renewal of changeless transcendent sacred realities.[1] This suggests the possibility that the ideas associated with Zion may themselves have differed significantly from traditional ideas of the type described by Eliade even though mythological themes were often associated with Zion.

---

[1] Hahn, The Old Testament, pp. 64-68, 78-81, 114-116, 138-142, Kraus, Geschichte, pp. 362-368, 416-419, A. R. Johnson, "The Psalms," The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H. H. Rowley (London: Oxford University Press, 1951), pp. 189-197, G. W. Anderson, "Hebrew Religion," The Old Testament and Modern Study, pp. 291-300, 304-306; cf. S. Szikszai, "King, Kingship," IDB, III, 14-17.

[2] S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, tr. G. W. Anderson (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954), pp. 64, 74, 269-270, 275-276. Similar to Mowinckel but stressing distinctive Israelite features of the New Year festival cult more strongly is A. R. Johnson, Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1955). For an attempt to interpret the Jerusalem New Year festival in terms of a myth and ritual sun cult patterned after a supposed Melqart sun cult at Tyre, see J. Morgenstern, The Fire Upon the Altar (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1963), and "New Year," IDB, III, 544-546. Morgenstern's theory seems much more narrowly based than those of Mowinckel and Johnson, depending to a great extent on late sources and including many tenuous and unusual subsidiary hypotheses.

---

[1] See especially *Cosmos and History: The Myth of the Eternal Return*, tr. W. R. Trask (Harper Torchbooks, TB 50; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959 [French original, 1949]), *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*, tr. W. R. Trask (Harper Torchbooks, TB 81; New York: Harper & Row, 1961 [French original, 1956]), and *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, tr. R. Sheed (Meridian Books, M 155; Cleveland: The World Publishing Co., 1963 [French original, 1953]), pp. 367-408. Some important antecedents of Eliade's work include A. J. Wensinck, *The Ideas of the Western Semites Concerning the Navel of the Earth* (Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afdeeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel XVII, No. 1; Amsterdam: Johannes Müller, 1916), E. Cassirer, *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, Vol. II: *Mythical Thought*, tr. R. Manheim (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955 [German original, 1925]), 83-94, 104-140, and G. van der Leeuw, *Religion in Essence and Manifestation*, tr. J. E. Turner (Harper Torchbooks, TB 100-101; New York: Harper & Row, 1963 [German original, 1933]), II, 384-402.

[2] Eliade, *Cosmos and History*, pp. 8-9, 15-18, 77-78; cf. 58-62, *The Sacred and the Profane*, pp. 39-45, 58-61, and *Patterns*, pp. 374-379.

Helpful at this point is the recent study by B. S. Childs in which he argues that mythological passages in the Old Testament should be interpreted as "broken myths."[2] Using traditional mythological themes of non-Israelite origin, Israel adapted them to express distinctively Israelite conceptions of reality, thus modifying or destroying their original significance. Mythical reality is essentially timeless in that the content of the primeval event is reactualized in a cultic event which shares the same content. "The two times sharing the same content are therefore identical."[3] Since nothing really new ever happens, Urzeit and Endzeit have the same content, both reflecting the essentially timeless reality of the myth.[4] In contrast to the modern linear view of time, the Old Testament retained the Urzeit-Endzeit pattern in the sense that the eschatological events of the future were analogical to the past.[1] But the pattern was modified in two important ways. First, the redemptive actions of God in history as chronological time rather than timeless primeval events were celebrated in the cult as giving structure to reality. Second, the eschatological events, though analogous with the old, also had a quality of newness which both fulfilled and transcended the old. Thus, in contrast to myth which functioned to maintain primeval reality, Old Testament eschatology looked forward to a new reality regarding the past as transitory.[2]

---

[1] Cosmos and History, pp. 102-112.

[2] Myth and Reality in the Old Testament (SBT, 27; Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1960). See especially his careful exegetical treatments of Gen. 1:1-2; 3:1-5; 6:1-4; Ex. 4:24-26; Is. 11:6-9; 14:12-21; pp. 30-71.

[3] Myth and Reality, p. 73.

[4] Ibid., pp. 72-74.

This modification of the mythical concept of time affected the mythical understanding of space as exemplified by Zion. In mythical thought, sacred places share the content of the primeval world structure and are therefore microcosmic copies of that structure, sharing its identity and essence.[3] Thus Zion could be identified mythically with Eden or heaven or Zaphon, the Canaanite mountain of God.[4] Nevertheless, this typical mythical pattern was modified or broken in fundamentally important ways. The establishment of Zion was represented not as a mythical event of the Urzeit or the creation of the world, but rather as a historical event in the time of David (II Sam. 6). Furthermore, the eschatological Zion was not identified with Eden but related to it only analogically (Is. 51:3). For prophets such as Isaiah, Micah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, Zion's holiness was not an inalienable quality stemming from its identification with a primeval holy space but depended rather upon a relationship to Yahweh which could be broken by Israel's sin.[5] Zion was thus a new sacred space which Yahweh created or brought into existence in Israel's history but which was rejected and misunderstood. "The prophetic hope looked to the future when the reality of the new creation already experienced would come in its fullness."[1] Thus the proper approach to a study of Zion as a theological symbol in the Old Testament must start, not with the mythological themes associated with it, but rather with the distinctive events, traditions, and cultic practices associated with the establishment of Zion in the time of David.

---

[1] Myth and Reality, pp. 74-77.

[2] Ibid., pp. 77-83.

[3] Ibid., pp. 83-84.

[4] Ibid., pp. 83-88.

[5] Ibid., pp. 88-91.

C. Alt, Noth, von Rad and the Study of Israel's Distinctive Traditions

The most important modern contributions to an understanding of the distinctive aspects of Israelite religion have been made by Alt, Noth and von Rad who have developed and refined the form-critical method of Gunkel in quite a different direction than Gressmann and Mowinckel. Investigating a great variety of specifically Israelite cultic, religious, and legal traditions, they have attempted to discover their origins in connection with particular tribes, sanctuaries and cult practices of the premonarchic period and then to trace their subsequent history and development during the monarchy. By this means they gradually elaborated a whole new picture of Israel's institutional and religious history which has been presented in two major syntheses, Noth's Geschichte Israels (1950) and von Rad's Theologie des Alten Testaments (1957-1960).[2]

In contrast to Canaanite cults and deities attached to local sanctuaries, the seminomadic pre-Israelite tribes worshipped clan gods who had revealed themselves to the tribal ancestor promising guidance and blessings to the tribe and a homeland in Palestine for its descendants.[1] Israel came into existence when a heterogeneous group of tribes formed a twelve-tribe religious confederacy at Shechem centering in an exclusive Yahwistic covenant cult based on the traditions of the Joseph tribes concerning the deliverance from Egypt.[2] The central cult place of the confederacy changed from time to time as the central cult object, the ark, was transferred from Shechem to Bethel to Gilgal and finally to Shiloh. The divine covenant law of the confederacy and the varied traditions of the individual tribes were elaborated partly by means of local Canaanite traditions and combined into comprehensive cycles of oral tradition. This elaboration of tradition was structured in terms of confessional summaries such as the one preserved in Deuteronomy 26:5-9 depicting the *Heilsgeschichte*, beginning with the patriarchs, centering in the exodus deliverance, and climaxing with divine leading into the land of Canaan.[3]

---

[1] Myth and Reality, p. 93.

[2] Cited here as M. Noth, The History of Israel, tr. S. Godman (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958), and G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, tr. D. M. G. Stalker (2 vols.; Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1962-1965); cf. Kraus, Geschichte, pp. 429-432.

One of the functions of the confederacy was the conduct of holy wars of self-defense according to traditional sacral rituals by volunteer tribal militias under the leadership of a charismatic warrior.[1]

---

[1] A. Alt, *Der Gott der Väter* (1929), *KS*, I, 1-78; cf. Noth, *History*, pp. 120-126, von Rad, *Theology*, I, 6-8, 165-175, and Kraus, *Geschichte*, pp. 370-371.

[2] M. Noth, *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels* (BWANT, IV:1; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1930), and *History*, pp. 85-108; cf. von Rad, *Theology*, I, 16-21, Kraus, *Geschichte*, p. 376.

[3] G. von Rad, *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch* (1938), *GS*, pp. 9-55, *Theology*, I, 121-125, *Genesis: A Commentary*, tr. J. H. Marks (London: SCM Press, 1961), pp. 13-23, M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (2. Aufl., Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1948), pp. 45-246, and *History*, pp. 109-137; cf. Kraus, *Geschichte*, pp. 402-411. On the legal traditions see A. Alt, *Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts* (1934), *KS*, I, 278-332, and M. Noth, *Die Gesetze im Pentateuch* (1940), *GS*, pp. 9-141.

The Philistine crisis and the rise of the Canaanite style monarchy under David and Solomon witnessed a partial disintegration of the tribal league and its functions, though its traditions, compiled in epic form by the Yahwist, continued to be elaborated.[2] At the same time the establishment of the Davidic dynasty and the founding of the Yahwistic sanctuary at Zion through the bringing of the ark and the building of the temple gave rise to two new sacral traditions analogous in character to the old Heilsgeschichte traditions of the tribal league.[3]

The work of Alt, Noth and von Rad has provided a broad and firm basis for treating Yahwism as a distinctive religious development. Though affected in very important ways by the assimilation of Canaanite religious ideas and practices at various stages in its career, it still retained its own specific identity. One dubious element in their reconstruction has been an insistence upon the separate and unrelated origins of the various major elements or themes of the Heilsgeschichte, especially the Sinai tradition, and also the almost complete independence of the

---

[1] G. von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel (3. Aufl., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958), pp. 5-33, Theology, I, 17, 307, and Noth, History, pp. 106-107.

[2] A. Alt, "Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina" (1930), KS, II, 1-65, "Das Grossreich Davids" (1950), KS, II, 66-75, G. von Rad, "Der Anfang der Geschichtsschreibung im alten Israel" (1944), GS, pp. 148-188, Theology, I, 36-64, and Noth, History, pp. 164-223.

[3] M. Noth, "Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition" (1950), GS, pp. 172-187, "Gott, König, Volk im Alten Testament" (1950), GS, pp. 188-229, "David und Israel in 2. Samuel 7" (1957), GS, pp. 334-345, History, pp. 190, 222-223, G. von Rad, "Das judäische Königsritual" (1947), GS, pp. 205-213, Theology, I, 39-48, 306-324, II, 155-175.

David and Zion themes. Furthermore, neither Noth nor von Rad has carried out a full scale investigation of the Zion tradition, though von Rad supposes it existed as an independent election theme only loosely associated with the theme of the election of David.

D. Recent Studies

Various attempts have been made either to modify or supplement the synthesis of Noth and von Rad at its weak points. In one such attempt, Artur Weiser stresses the continuity of the Zion cult with the archetypal Sinai theophany and covenant tradition.[1] He argues that the autumn New Year festival was celebrated at the temple in Jerusalem as a covenant renewal festival deriving from the premonarchic tribal league and associated with the ark of the covenant as its central cult symbol. The festival included a cultic re-enactment or recitation of the sacral traditions of the Pentateuchal *Heilsgeschichte* and various other covenant renewal actions. But the climactic point of the ritual was a cultic theophany above the ark in which Yahweh was pictured as coming from Sinai riding on a cloud symbolized by the cherubim. Weiser brings together a large number of psalms and a variety of other passages in terms of this one seemingly all-pervasive *Sitz im Leben*. His tendency to schematize without a clear methodological procedure opens his theory as a whole to considerable doubt.[1] But he does succeed in showing the importance of the ark and cherubim as a cult theophany symbol in various psalms and in the temple cult. As a supplement to Weiser's theory, Schmid has assembled solid evidence that the picture of Yahweh as king in the psalms was assimilated to the theophany symbolism of the ark from Canaanite Elyon traditions of pre-Davidic Jerusalem.[2] These constitute important contributions to the understanding of the history and significance of Zion itself as a theological symbol.

---

[1] Weiser stated his views in a preliminary way in his article, "Zur Frage nach den Beziehungen der Psalmen zum Kult: die Darstellung der Theophanie in den Psalmen und im Festkult" (1950), reprinted in *Glaube und Geschichte im Alten Testament und andere ausgewählte Schriften* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), pp. 303-321, and developed them more fully in *The Psalms: A Commentary*, tr. H. Hartwell (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962), pp. 23-91; cf. Kraus, *Geschichte*, pp. 421-422.

Kraus has made the most important recent investigations of the Zion tradition within the general frame of reference established by Noth and von Rad. His first study attempted to show that the twin themes of the election of David and of Zion were celebrated in a "royal Zion festival" on the first day of Tabernacles which he regarded as a covenant renewal festival.[3] The royal Zion festival and the two election themes on which it was based originated in David's transferral of the ark to Zion (II Sam. 6) and Nathan's dynastic oracle to David (II Sam. 7), and were celebrated together as evident from Psalm 132. From this festival also derive other psalms reflecting a procession of the ark to Zion or the installation of the Davidic dynasty. However, in strong opposition to Mowinckel, Kraus insisted that the psalms of Yahweh's enthronement reflect a postexilic reformulation of this festival. Under the influence of Deutero-Isaiah and the Babylonian Marduk procession, they portray a processional celebration of the return of Yahweh to Zion, culminating in his theophany appearance and enthronement as king.[1]

---

[1] W. Beyerlin, Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions, tr. S. Rudman (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), has partially remedied this defect by analyzing the Pentateuchal Sinai materials in a systematic and methodologically careful way. However his attempt to use this material as evidence for reconstructing the content and history of the covenant festival from its Mosaic beginnings at Kadesh clear down to the period of the monarchy and the Solomonic temple seems rather tenuous when taken as a whole. Among other things it depends heavily upon a detailed source analysis and assignment of a Sitz im Leben for each individual pericope in Exodus 19-20; 24; 32-34. See especially his summary, pp. 145-170.

[2] H. Schmid, "Jahwe und die Kulttraditionen von Jerusalem," ZAW, LXVII (1955), 168-197 [cited hereafter as "Kulttraditionen"].

[3] H. J. Kraus, Die Königsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament: Untersuchungen zu den Liedern von Jahwes Thronbesteigung (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 13; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1951), pp. 27-81.

In a subsequent study Kraus stressed the centrality of the ark as linking the election of Zion and David with the cult traditions of Shiloh and the tribal league.[2] However, in a reversal of his earlier views, he conceded that the theme of Yahweh's kingship, based on pre-Israelite Canaanite-Jebusite Elyon traditions, came to be celebrated in pre-exilic times in connection with the processional entry of the ark as a theophany and throne symbol into Zion.[3] This provides a firm basis for reconstructing the origins of Zion as a theological symbol in two stages. The first stage, in the time of David, is the transferral to Zion of themes and traditions associated with the ark at Shiloh. The second stage is the assimilation of pre-Israelite Jerusalem Elyon themes.

Other recent studies of Zion themes have not moved the discussion very far beyond this point. Schreiner offers an essentially similar picture of the development of the Zion tradition but sees Zion fundamentally as a symbol of Yahweh's eternal and universal sovereignty on the one hand

---

[1] Königsherrschaft Gottes, pp. 1-26, 99-146.

[2] H. J. Kraus, Worship in Israel: A Cultic History of the Old Testament, tr. G. Buswell (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966), pp. 179-200, cf. Psalmen (BKAT, 15; 2. Aufl., Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1961), II, 879-883.

[3] Worship, pp. 201-218; cf. Psalmen, I, 197-205, 342-345.

and his presence as a source of blessing in the midst of his people.[1] Likewise Clements, in an excellent study of the symbolism of God's presence and transcendence in the Jerusalem temple cult and its antecedents, posits an essentially similar line of development except that he stresses more strongly the Jebusite-Canaanite elements.[2] Of special value is his concise study of the throne and theophany symbolism of the ark and cherubim in the Shiloh cult as an antecedent of the Zion tradition.[3] Both Schreiner and Clements avoid attempts to reconstruct the autumn festival, thereby implying perhaps that no such attempt is sufficiently convincing to be used as a working hypothesis. Despite the doubtfulness of such reconstructions, a general recognition in recent years of the importance of the ark in the Jerusalem temple cult and the Psalms has provided new possibilities for understanding the development of Zion's theological symbolism.[4]

---

[1] J. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem Jahwes Königssitz: Theologie der Heiligen Stadt im Alten Testament* (Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 7; München: Kösel-Verlag, 1963).

[2] R. E. Clements, *God and Temple* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), pp. 40-78.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 28-39.

[4] S. Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, tr. D. R. Ap-Thomas (2 vols.; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), I, 20-21, 94, 127, 174-177, II, 76, 80 [cited hereafter as *Psalms*], Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, pp. 17-18, 61-68, 74, Weiser, *Psalms*, pp. 26-27, 29-30, 38-42, Kraus, *Worship*, pp. 207, 210-215, 220, G. H. Davies, "The Ark in the Psalms," *Promise and Fulfilment: Essays Presented to Professor S. H. Hooke*, ed. F. F. Bruce (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1963), pp. 51-61, and "Ark of the Covenant," *IDB*, I, 225-226. This topic has now been investigated extensively by T. E. Fretheim, *The Cultic Use of the Ark of the Covenant in the Monarchial Period* (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1967), a work which, unfortunately, I was unable to consult until my own writing was nearly finished, though occasional references will be made to it in the footnotes [cited hereafter as *Ark*].

E. The Methods and Aims of This Study

By necessity Old Testament scholarship as a historical discipline is based primarily upon a very sharply circumscribed body of literary evidence. Only to a limited degree can it rely upon the discovery of new documentary or other material evidence. Instead it moves forward primarily by the elaboration of new methods of studying the sources and evidence already known in order to derive new insights from them. But the limitations of his evidence are such that the Old Testament scholar usually cannot attain answers to his questions which are provable beyond reasonable doubt. Instead his results are nearly always sufficiently ambiguous or conjectural to be open to considerable question. To a great extent Old Testament scholarship consists in rearranging the same items of evidence into ever new hypothetical structures and patterns. Any significant work of scholarship is an elaborate web of interconnected hypotheses based on hundreds of exegetical decisions, no one of which can be defended with complete confidence. The power of a scholarly theory does not, therefore, consist in the indisputability of each individual item of evidence. Rather it consists in the ability of the hypothetical structure elaborated by the scholar to interpret a large number of passages plausibly in relation to one another without moving completely beyond the evidence into sheer speculation and without departing too far from at least one commonly accepted interpretation of most passages. The most creative works of Old Testament scholarship are sometimes those which take the risk of adopting one basic method or hypothesis and pushing it to its furthest limits, trying to unite all possible evidence around it and leaving to others the task of determining through a process of critical evaluation and testing what the real limits of plausibility are.

The basic aim of this study is to elaborate the hypothesis that the significance of Zion as a theological symbol can best be interpreted as a development of holy war and theophany themes associated with the ark and cherubim at the beginning of the monarchic period. In so far as possible other themes and problems will be treated as ancillary and subsidiary to this central hypothesis. The first chapter will study the theme of Yahweh's theophany holy war intervention as associated with the ark and cherubim in the Yahwistic cult at Shiloh. Chapter two will show how these themes, transferred with the ark to Zion by David, formed the basis of the royally sponsored Yahwistic cult which eventually received its permanent home in Solomon's temple. The third chapter will study the original meanings and geographical references of the words Jerusalem and Zion and compare their usage and distribution in the Old Testament.

The next three chapters will deal with the significance of Zion as a theological symbol in the Psalms growing out of the cultic synthesis of David and Solomon. Chapter four, based primarily on psalms celebrating Yahweh's kingship, will show how the holy war and theophany symbolism of the ark and cherubim at Zion was enhanced by the assimilation of pre-Israelite Elyon mythological and cosmological themes. Chapter five, based primarily on the royal psalms, will show how this combination of themes formed the basis for promises of victory and dominion to the Davidic king. Chapter six, based on the Zion psalms, will show how the same combination of themes was used to portray Zion itself as a symbol of security and divine protection.

Chapter seven will show how, during the political and military crises arising from the expansion of Assyria, Isaiah used the traditional theme of Yahweh's holy war theophany intervention on behalf of Zion as the basis for radical promises of deliverance and correspondingly radical demands for trust in the face of military dangers. Chapter eight will show first how the traditional function of Zion as a theological symbol partially disintegrated after the time of Isaiah, partly through prophets such as Micah and Jeremiah turning the holy war traditions of Zion against Zion itself. The last chapter will study the reinterpretation of Zion as an eschatological symbol by Deutero-Isaiah and the prophets of the postexilic period in continuity with the older holy war and theophany traditions.

CHAPTER I. TRADITIONS OF PREMONARCHIC ORIGIN CONCERNING THE ARK AND CHERUBIM

Two cultic innovations are recounted in Samuel-Kings as being of outstanding importance in Jerusalem during the period of the united monarchy. The first is David's installation of the ark in the City of David (II Sam. 6). The second is Solomon's building of the temple, climaxed by the transferral of the ark from the City of David to the inner sanctuary of the temple (I Kgs. 8:1-13). These two passages together with Psalm 132 show the importance of the ark in connection with the origins of both dynastic and Zion theology.[1] In order to discover the role of the ark in the origin and development of the theology of Zion one must first seek to ascertain the ideas and themes associated with it at the beginning of the monarchic period. One need go into the problem of the origin or actual prehistory of the ark only insofar as this can show what ideas were associated with the ark in the time of David and Solomon.

A. The Ark in the Yahwistic Stratum of the Pentateuch

The ark is mentioned explicitly at only two places in the Yahwistic stratum of the Pentateuch. But these passages occur at crucial points in the narrative. Assuming with many recent scholars that the Yahwistic materials were compiled at Jerusalem during the united monarchy, these passages may indicate the significance attached to the ark at this time.[1] The compilers of the traditions, presumably connected with the royal court or temple, would have been quite conscious that the ark about which the traditions spoke was now present in Zion as the central Yahwistic cult object.

---

[1] Noth, "Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition," pp. 174-177, 184-185, O. Eissfeldt, "Silo und Jerusalem" (1957), KS, III, 417-425, and Kraus, Königsherrschaft Gottes, pp. 51-59.

Numbers 10:33-36 provides evidence for at least two distinct themes connected with the ark.[2] Verse 33 connects the ark with the Yahwistic narrative as a whole by picturing it as the means whereby Yahweh led Israel away from Sinai. It implies that the custom was for the ark not only to lead them but to "spy out" a resting place for them (*lātûr* *lāhem* *m^{e}nûḥâ*).[1] The term *m^{e}nûḥâ* means not only a place of encampment and rest in a literal sense but implies safety and security from enemies.[2] Thus the ark here stands not only for guidance but for security within the presence of Yahweh. Although the ark is not regularly mentioned in the rather fragmentary JE narratives of the wilderness marches, this passage may also imply a belief that the ark represented Yahweh leading Israel from Sinai through the wilderness and eventually to the promised land.

---

[1] On this dating almost a scholarly consensus has developed in recent years. Cf. von Rad, "Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch," pp. 76, 79-81, *Genesis*, pp. 23, 29, M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte*, p. 249, *Exodus: A Commentary*, tr. J. S. Bowden (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962), pp. 14-15, C. A. Simpson, "The Growth of the Hexateuch," *IB*, I (1952), 194a-196a, J. Bright, *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), pp. 65, 198, A. Weiser, *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development*, tr. D. M. Barton (New York: Association Press, 1961), pp. 102, 108-110, D. N. Freedman, "Pentateuch," *IDB*, III, 714b. O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, tr. P. R. Ackroyd (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), pp. 197-198, 200 [cited hereafter as *Introduction*], and R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941), pp. 147-148, suggest a date only slightly later.

[2] The critical analysis of this passage is complicated both because it interrupts the context rather abruptly and because it seems to fall apart into three fragments, vss. 33,34,35-36, which do not cohere well with one another. One may reasonably regard vs. 34 with its mention of the cloud above them as a late redactional harmonization with P, especially since its position after vs. 36 in the LXX indicates that it is only loosely rooted in the textual tradition. Although the phrase *b^{e}rît yhwh* in vs. 33 may be Deuteronomic, the rest of the verse is not. Fretheim, *Ark*, pp. 8-15, has shown that the word *b^{e}rît* in such circumstances is not necessarily a mark of Deuteronomic redaction. G. von Rad, "Zelt und Lade" (1931), *GS*, pp. 119-120, hardly seems justified in regarding vs. 33 as a secondary device to fit the ark chants of vss. 35-36 into the context. The ark chant is reported at this point because of the mention of the ark leading Israel from Sinai and not vice versa. There is no other plausible explanation for the ark chants being introduced at this point. One may best regard vs. 33 and vss. 35-36 as two different traditions of the function of the ark which are both old. In fact vs. 33 may connect in some way with the promise in Ex. 33:14 that Yahweh's *pānîm* will accompany Moses and give him rest (*pānay yēlēkû wah^{a}nîhōtî lāk*). In his notes on Exodus, *OAB*, pp. 111-112, B. W. Anderson sees an allusion to the ark in this verse. In a more recent statement, von Rad, *Theology*, I, p. 237, accepts the view of many commentators that a JE account of the

The two ark chants preserved in verses 35-36 are by general consensus very ancient.

35b *qûmâ* *yhwh* / *w^{e}yāpûṣû* *’ôy^{e}beykā* / *w^{e}yānûsû* *m^{e}śan^{e}’eykā*
36b *šûbâ* *yhwh* / *rib^{e}bôt* *’alpê* *yiśrā’ēl*

They are clearly tied to one another in the traditional form in which they are here preserved. One must assume that, whatever their origin, they were used together when the ark was located at one or another

---

setting up of the ark once stood after Ex. 33:6 but has been eliminated in favor of the P account. Similarly, Davies, "Ark of the Covenant," p. 225. On the analysis of Num. 10:33-36 see N. H. Snaith, "Numbers," *PCB*, §220a,d, Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte*, pp. 34, 324-325, and J. Marsh, "The Book of Numbers: Introduction and Exegesis," *IB*, II (1953), 193.

[1] The recurrence of the phrase *derek* *š^{e}lōšet* *yāmîm* is commonly regarded as dittography, Snaith, "Numbers," §220d. But all of vs. 33b as an explanatory statement indicates that the custom was for the ark to lead them in marches of a few days length between major resting places.

[2] So especially in I Kgs. 5:18. According to G. von Rad, "Es ist noch eine Ruhe vorhanden dem Volke Gottes" (1933), *GS*, pp. 101-104, the noun *m^{e}nûḥâ* together with the verb *hēnîaḥ* (root *nwḥ*) became almost a technical word in Deuteronomic theology for Yahweh's gift of salvation in the promised land. In Num. 10:33, however, this technical meaning is not yet evident.

Israelite sanctuary in Palestine. They thus imply that the ark as the symbol of Yahweh's presence went forth with Israel into battle from its place at the sanctuary and then returned victoriously with Israel to rest at the sanctuary.[1] Yahweh's presence seems to be closely identified with the ark. That it is a throne symbol is however not self-evident in this passage.[2] But the most important point here is the evident role of the ark as a holy war cult symbol. One may fairly assume that it played a customary and important role in Israelite sacral warfare even though it is mentioned only once in the book of Judges (20:27).[3] The attribution of the chant to Moses may also indicate that the presence of Yahweh with the ark as it went forth to battle was customarily invoked by a cultic official connected with the ark.

The importance of these ideas associated with the ark in the development of Zion theology in the early period of the monarchy is indicated especially by the use of the first ark chant in Psalm 68:2. Likewise an echo of one or both of the chants appears in the chant in Psalm 132:8 accompanying the ceremonious installation of the ark in its appointed place in the Jerusalem sanctuary.[1] Less explicit allusions to one or the other of the chants occur in several other psalms, especially individual and community laments dating from various periods.[2] This shows that ancient holy war ideas associated with the ark were kept alive at Jerusalem, permeating various cultic usages and at the same time undergoing appropriate modifications.

---

[1] Similarly R. Smend, *Jahwekrieg und Stämmebund: Erwägungen zur ältesten Geschichte Israels* (FRLANT, 84; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), p. 58; cf. J. de Fraine, "La royauté de Yahvé dans le textes concernant l'arche," *Volume du Congrès Geneve 1965* (SVT, 15; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966), p. 146.

[2] Throne symbolism has long been assumed in this passage by most interpreters. See for example W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, tr. J. A. Baker (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961, 1967), I, 108, and von Rad, "Zelt und Lade," p. 116, and *Theology*, I, 236-237. Von Rad even emends *šûbâ*, vs. 36, to *šᵉbâ* (root *yšb*) to make the throne symbolism more explicit. Against the theory that the ark was ever by itself a throne symbol see Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 28-35.

[3] Cf. von Rad, *Heilige Krieg*, p. 28.

The next mention of the ark in the Yahwistic stratum occurs in connection with the story of the abortive attack on Canaan from the south, Numbers 14:39-45.[3] The defeat is attributed to the fact that Yahweh was not among them as they went into battle (*kî ’ên yhwh* *b^{e}qirb^{e}kem*, vs. 42), which is then clarified by the explanation that neither the ark nor Moses departs from the camp. This passage thus confirms in a negative way the intimate connection of the ark with holy war. It further confirms the custom, implied in Numbers 10:35-36, whereby a cultic official associated with the ark must invoke Yahweh's presence and send the ark forth into battle. In the larger context of the Yahwistic narrative this passage agrees with Numbers 10:33 in implying that the ark represented Yahweh guiding Israel to the promised land even when they rebelled against his guidance.

---

[1] The words *qûmâ yhwh* in Ps. 132:8 = II Chr. 6:41 are identical with the opening words of the first ark chant. The following word *limnûḥātekā* recalls the words *ûb^{e}nûḥōh yō’mar* which introduce the second ark chant. The function of the chant in Ps. 132:8 and II Chr. 6:41 resembles more nearly that of the second chant of Num. 10:35-36 in that they appear to accompany the installation or reinstallation of the ark in its customary resting place in the sanctuary.

[2] Davies, "The Ark in the Psalms," pp. 51-61, and "Ark of the Covenant," p. 225, sees such allusions in Pss. 3:8; 6:5; 7:7; 9:20; 10:12; 17:13; 90:13; 126:4 and with less certainty 21:14; 35:2; 44:27; 74:22; 80:15; 82:8. A similar list of psalm passages alluding to the ark is given by Weiser, *Psalms*, p. 39; cf. Kraus, *Worship*, p. 220.

[3] On the assignment of this passage to the J or JE stratum see Snaith, "Numbers," §221j, Marsh, "Numbers," p. 214, and Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte*, p. 34. Noth's attempt, p. 224, to treat the reference to the ark in vs. 44 as a secondary addition has no basis other than the infrequency of allusions to the ark in J.

B. The Ark in Joshua and Judges

The ark plays an important role in Joshua 3-6, the stories of the crossing of the Jordan and the conquest of Jericho. Although the critical and historical problems posed by these chapters are far from any satisfactory solution, the narrative traditions used by the Deuteronomic compiler of these chapters probably represent a continuation of the JE strata of the Pentateuch.[1] Originally they may have represented Benjaminite traditions stemming from an ark festival at Gilgal celebrating the exodus from Egypt, the entrance into Canaan, and the occupation of the land.[2] Since the role of the ark is entirely different than in Deuteronomy, the antiquity of the traditions in Joshua 3-6 may be confidently affirmed over against the view that they are largely Deuteronomic creations.[3] One may plausibly assume that these stories about the ark and the entrance into Canaan were later preserved in oral tradition form in connection with the ark at Shiloh though no longer re-enacted cultically.[1] Thus they would have been part of the stock of traditional ideas and stories associated with the ark when it was brought to Jerusalem. In the Yahwistic epic they would have been understood in continuity with the references to the ark in Numbers 10:33-36 and 14:39-45 implying that the ark guided Israel from Sinai to the entry into Canaan.

---

[1] M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1943), pp. 40-47, and Das Buch Josua (HAT, I:7; 2. Aufl., Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953), challenged the older literary-critical view that the JE narratives are continued in Josh. 2-11. Similarly G. W. Anderson, A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1959), pp. 59-60. J. Bright, "The Book of Joshua: Introduction and Exegesis," IB, II (1953), 544, continues to maintain the older point of view against Noth. On the whole, Bright's view seems more plausible since the JE narrative in the preceding books certainly looks forward to some such climactic account of the entrance into Canaan and the occupation of the promised land.

[2] H. J. Kraus, "Gilgal--Eine Beitrag zur Kultusgeschichte Israels," VT, I (1951), 181-199, Worship, pp. 152-165, and Fretheim, Ark, pp. 57-65. Cf. E. M. Good, "Joshua, Book of," IDB, II, 990, and F. M. Cross Jr., "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations, ed. A. Altmann (Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies, Brandeis University, Texts and Studies, 3; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), pp. 26-27.

[3] Fretheim, Ark, pp. 52-53.

Several important ideas and themes are stressed or repeated in the over-all context.[2] The manner of Yahweh's self-manifestation in connection with the ark is nowhere indicated in these chapters. Yet the awesome divine power associated with the ark is everywhere stressed.[3] The crossing of the Jordan is a stylized analogy of the crossing of the Sea of Reeds in the exodus from Egypt.[4] By means of the ark Yahweh's presence accompanies his people safely through the watery perils and guides them to the goal toward which he has been leading them.

The conquest of Jericho (Josh. 6) is a highly stylized holy war story with the ark carried in procession as the cultic symbol mediating the powerful and victorious intervention of Yahweh.[1] The victory is miraculously accomplished without human action other than the divinely prescribed processional ritual with the ark. The oracular formula promising divinely given victory is mediated through Joshua (*r^{e}’ēh nātattî b^{e}yād^{e}kā ’et-y^{e}rîḥô w^{e}’et-malkāh*, vs. 2, *nātan yhwh lākem ’et-hā^{c}îr*, vs. 16). Priests carry out the characteristic ritual of trumpet blowing, the signal of Yahweh's intervention and a method of inducing panic, as they accompany the ark in the stylized procession around the city (*w^{e}hakkôh^{a}nîm yitq^{e}^{c}û baššôpārôt* or the like, vss. 4,8,9,13,16).[2] At the climactic moment the people shout the ritual war cry (noun *t^{e}rû^{c}â*, verb *hērîa^{c}*, vss. 5,10,16,20). The divine intervention seems to occur simply through the presence of the ark, dramatically demonstrated in the miraculous collapse of the walls (vss. 5,20). The *ḥērem* is carried out with thoroughness (vss. 17-19,21).[3] Throughout the entire account Joshua appears as the human initiator of the cultic actions, mediating divine instructions and directing the movements of the ark.

---

[1] Kraus, *Worship*, p. 177, makes a similar suggestion concerning another Gilgal tradition.

[2] One must not stress small details since there is no agreement concerning the extent and character of the Deuteronomic editing of these passages or the separation of various strands of material. Note, for example, the lack of consistency in the terminology referring to the ark: simply *hā’ārôn*, five times; *’^{a}rôn yhwh*, six times; *’^{a}rôn yhwh ’^{e}lôhêkem*, once; *’^{a}rôn yhwh ’^{a}dôn kol-hā’āres*, once; *’^{a}rôn habb^{e}rît*, six times; *’^{a}rôn b^{e}rît yhwh*, three times; *’^{a}rôn b^{e}rît yhwh ’^{e}lôhêkem*, once; *hā’ārôn habb^{e}rît*, *hā’ārôn b^{e}rît yhwh*, and *’^{a}rôn habb^{e}rît ’^{a}dôn kol-hā’āres*, each once and all three ungrammatical. Furthermore, they are interspersed with one another in such confusion that they hardly provide satisfactory clues for source analysis. Assuming that *b^{e}rît* is primarily a Deuteronomic or Priestly usage and, in the three ungrammatical cases, a scribal error, the older titles are perhaps *hā’ārôn*, *’^{a}rôn yhwh*, and possibly *’^{a}rôn yhwh ’^{a}dôn kol-hā’āres*.

[3] Fretheim, *Ark*, p. 215.

[4] This analogy is stated explicitly in Josh. 4:23 and echoed in Ps. 114. Cf. Kraus, *Worship*, pp. 157, 159.

In the story in Joshua 7 of Achan violating the rules of *ḥērem* attached to the Jericho story, another significant ritual is associated with the ark. Though again highly stylized, the story perhaps reflects a traditional practice associated with the ark. After the defeat at Ai,

---

[1] Cf. J. Pedersen, *Israel: Its Life and Culture* (4 vols. in 2; Copenhagen: Branner og Korch, 1926, 1940), III-IV, 20-21, and von Rad, *Heilige Krieg*, pp. 43-44.

[2] On the trumpet blowing as a panic-inducing ritual which at the same time signals Yahweh's intervention see especially Jud. 7:17-22.

[3] On these details as typical characteristics of holy war see Pedersen, *Israel*, III-IV, 20-31, and von Rad, *Heilige Krieg*, pp. 6-14.

Joshua and the elders of Israel lament before the ark and Joshua receives an oracle explaining the reason for the defeat (vss. 6-13). The ritual of "bringing near" (*qārab*, *hiqrîb*) the tribes, families and households in order that Yahweh might "take"(*lākad*) the guilty party must be understood as occurring before the ark, though the exact manner of obtaining Yahweh's decision is not indicated.[1]

Clear references to the ark are surprisingly rare elsewhere in the books of Joshua and Judges. The problematic mention of the ark in Joshua 8:33 in connection with the ritual of blessing and cursing at Mt. Ebal and Mt. Gerizim is hardly dependable evidence of an early tradition.[2] In Judges 20:27 the parenthetical statement about the ark being at Bethel is perhaps more significant. The most plausible suggestion is that the ark was brought temporarily to Bethel in connection with the holy war conducted against Benjamin by the rest of the tribes.[3] The parenthetical statement about the ark being at Bethel clarifies the story concerning Israel gathering at Bethel after their defeats to lament and to obtain oracles from Yahweh (Jud. 20:18,23,26). This confirms once again the traditional association of the ark with holy war and indicates that expressions such as lipnê-yhwh in cultic contexts such as this may often have been understood as allusions to the ark.[1]

---

[1] The term *lākad* used in similar rituals in I Sam. 10:20-21; 14:41-42, indicates some method of casting lots. In I Sam. 10:20-21, the story of the selection of Saul as king at Mizpah, there is no indication that the ark is present though the terms *lipnê yhwh* (vs. 19) and *hiqrîb* (vss. 20-21) are used and an oracle is obtained from Yahweh (vs. 22). In I Sam. 14:41-42, like Joshua 7, the question is to determine who has violated a holy war regulation. Here the Urim and Thummim are the means of casting lots. H. G. May, "Joshua," *PCB*, §254d, thinks Josh. 7 is deliberately reminiscent of the story in Num. 14:39-45 (discussed above) about the disobedient attack on Canaan from the south.

[2] This passage must be connected with Deut. 11:26-32 and 27 where the ark is not mentioned. Kraus, *Worship*, pp. 164-165, suggests on the basis of Deut. 11:29-30 that this ritual might have been transferred at some time from Shechem to Gilgal. But at the same time, pp. 127, 144, he regards the mention of the ark in Josh. 8:33 as an interpolation. Cf. Smend, *Jahwekrieg und Stämmebund*, pp. 65-66.

[3] So W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (4th ed., Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1956), p. 104. Although the stories in Jud. 17-21 are commonly regarded as a post-Deuteronomic appendix, much of the content may derive from premonarchic Benjaminite tribal traditions. On the antiquity of the basic narrative concerning the Benjaminite war (Jud. 19-21) see J. M. Myers, "The Book of Judges: Introduction and

Noth's theory that the ark, constituting the chief cult object at the central sanctuary of the tribal amphictyony from the very beginning, was located first at Shechem and then successively at Bethel, Gilgal and Shiloh, is difficult to demonstrate although widely accepted.[2] Whatever

---

Exegesis," IB, II (1953), 678b-679a, 808, who assigns it to the J document. For contrasting views concerning the historicity of the references to the ark at Bethel see Noth, History, p. 94, who thinks the ark was stationed at Bethel for a time making it the central sanctuary of the tribal league, and Smend, Jahwekrieg und Stämmebund, pp. 67-69, who doubts the historicity of these references in any sense.

[1] Davies, "Ark of the Covenant," p. 225, and "The Ark in the Psalms," pp. 60-61.

[2] Noth's influential theories concerning the Israelite amphictyony are stated at length in Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels. His hypothesis concerning the movements of the ark and the central sanctuary are summarized in History, pp. 91-95. See also his article, "Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition," pp. 184-186. J. Dus, "Der Brauch der Ladewanderung im alten Israel," Theologische Zeitschrift Basel, XVII (1961), 1-16, makes a speculative attempt to show that there was a regular custom of moving the ark from one cult place to another every seven years. Kraus, Worship, p. 127, rejects this theory but accepts Noth's view that the ark was stationed successively at Shechem, Bethel, Gilgal and Shiloh. Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, pp. 103-104, contends that the ark and Israelite central sanctuary were located permanently at Shiloh from the time of the conquest until the destruction of Shiloh by the Philistines. His argument is based on the tradition in Josh. 18-22 that the tent of meeting was set up at Shiloh immediately after the conquest. Smend, Jahwekrieg und Stämmebund, pp. 70-78, also connects the ark primarily with Shiloh and with the Rachel tribes, especially Joseph. In this connection Smend argues at length that the practice of holy war (he prefers the term "Jahwekrieg") was a contribution of the Rachel tribes to the Israelite tribal league.

the value of this hypothesis, no very explicit traditions concerning these supposed movements of the ark and central sanctuary are preserved in the Old Testament. Thus we may doubt that any such tradition played an important role at Jerusalem in the early period of the monarchy.

C. The Ark in Samuel

A very significant reference to the ark occurs in I Samuel 3, the story of Samuel receiving a great prophetic revelation in the presence of the ark in the temple of Yahweh at Shiloh (vs. 3b). According to conventional literary criticism, I Samuel 1-3 is ascribed to the so-called Late Source.[1] Actually the materials in this section are probably much more complex than this, in most cases preserving old traditions.[2] The story in chapter 3 may be classed as a popular prophetic legend of the type frequently used in the Deuteronomic history to indicate divine judgment and guidance at work in Israel's history. It venerates Samuel as the ideal prototype of a prophet of Yahweh.[3] In its present context following the birth story in I Samuel 1 the call story almost implies that Samuel is the successor to Moses.[1] It is distinctive, however, in connecting the call closely with the ark. The cultic situation portrayed is that of an incubation oracle received shortly before dawn in the presence of the ark. The experience is otherwise entirely charismatic in character. After Samuel repeatedly hears a voice addressing him, Yahweh comes and takes his stand (*wayyābô' yhwh wayyityaṣṣēb*, vs. 10) in a theophany appearance to pronounce the word of doom against the house of Eli.[2] Though the text is not explicit one may assume the theophany is closely connected with the ark. Thus this story pointedly connects the ark and the Shiloh sanctuary with Samuel's prophetic reception and pronouncement of an oracle of judgment and doom and his subsequent prophetic status. In this respect it is reminiscent of Isaiah's call vision in the temple (Is. 6) and Amos' oracle about Yahweh roaring from Zion (Am. 1:2; cf. Jer. 25:30; Joel 4:16). The summarizing conclusion stresses that repeated revelations of this sort came to Samuel at Shiloh so that he became established as Yahweh's authoritative prophetic mediator for all Israel (3:20-4:1a). In connection with this tradition, Psalm 99:6-7 mentions Samuel along with Moses and Aaron as prototypes of those priests to whom Yahweh spoke in the pillar of cloud (vs. 7). Since verses 1 and 5 allude to the cherubim and the ark in terms of their throne and footstool symbolism, this confirms that the pillar-of-cloud and Sinai theophany traditions were associated with them in the Jerusalem cult tradition, probably depending upon traditions deriving from Shiloh.[1]

---

[1] G. B. Caird, "The First and Second Books of Samuel: Introduction and Exegesis," IB, II (1953), 856-861; cf. Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 341-373. The three-source analysis of Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 269-281, has not been widely accepted but has recently been followed by S. Szikszai, "Samuel, I and II," IDB, IV, 204-209. The more recent tendency to concentrate on smaller narrative and form-critical units in Samuel is more satisfactory; cf. Weiser, The Old Testament, pp. 161-170.

[2] R. Press, "Der Prophet Samuel," ZAW, LVI (1938), 177-225, separates three strands of material throughout chaps. 1-15 and tries to trace the oral tradition history of each one to premonarchic origins. H. W. Hertzberg, I & II Samuel: A Commentary, tr. J. S. Bowden (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964), pp. 34, 39, 44, sees traces of an account of the fall of the sons of Eli and an account of the rise of Samuel in chaps. 1-3. These were originally independent of one another but had already been interwoven long before being used by the Deuteronomic compiler of the book.

[3] Cf. Weiser, The Old Testament, pp. 61-62, 166-167, Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 45-46, and A. Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament (2 vols.; 2d ed., Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1952), I, 238-239.

---

[1] This significant point was called to my attention by R. B. Y. Scott in a letter of April 23, 1967.

[2] The verb *hityaṣṣēb* is used frequently of men taking a stand to await a divine act of deliverance or revelation. But in Ex. 34:5 it is used of Yahweh appearing to Moses in a cloud theophany on Mt. Sinai (*wayyēred yhwh be*^{c}*ānān wayyityaṣṣēb* ^{c}*immô šām*) in a way that notably resembles the expression in I Sam. 3:10. Hertzberg, *Samuel*, p. 41, also regards I Sam. 3:10 as a theophany appearance.

By relating I Samuel 3 to Numbers 12:6-8, Deuteronomy 18:15-18 and Exodus 20:18-21, Kraus developed the interesting hypothesis that there was an important traditional prophetic office closely associated with the Mosaic and Sinai sacral traditions.[2] He suggests that certain outstanding individuals were especially authorized to fill a "Mosaic prophetic office" as cultic mediators of "the renewal of the covenant and the fresh proclamation of the divine law."[3] I Samuel 3 shows how this cultic and charismatic authorization took place at the central sanctuary of the tribal league. Among the young men dedicated to Yahweh it was expected that occasionally one would experience a direct call by means of an incubation oracle received in the divine presence in the sanctuary and confirmed by the fulfillment of the oracle. In contrast with other cultic prophets who received revelations only indirectly through dreams or visions, this one was thought to have "direct communion" with Yahweh, qualifying him to be a uniquely authoritative mediator between Yahweh and Israel. Kraus finds echoes of this institution in the distinctive sense of authority and immediate access to Yahweh expressed by such notable prophetic figures as Ahijah of Shiloh, the "Man of God" from Bethel in I Kings 13:11-32, Micaiah, Elijah, Jeremiah, and in the prophetic oracles imbedded in Psalms 50:7-15; 81:6b-17; 95:7b-11.[1] Thus I Samuel 3 indicates the possible significance of the ark at Shiloh and later at Jerusalem as the focal point of cultic theophanies and oracular prophetic revelations.[2]

---

[1] Cf. Weiser, Psalms, pp. 641-644, and Kraus, Psalmen, II, 684-685.

[2] H. J. Kraus, Worship, pp. 105-112, based on his earlier study, Die prophetische Verkündigung des Rechts in Israel (Theologische Studien, 51; Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1957). Cf. M. Newman, "The Prophetic Call of Samuel," Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg, ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962), pp. 86-97.

[3] Kraus, Worship, p. 108.

Of greater importance than anything so far discussed is the ark narrative of I Samuel 4-6 plus II Samuel 6. One may presuppose the widely accepted view that these two passages originally constituted an independent story which functioned as a hieros logos of the Yahwistic cult at Jerusalem founded by David.[3] Although functioning as a cultic legend, it may nevertheless be assumed to reflect with reasonable accuracy the movements of the ark from the time it was removed from Shiloh until David brought it to Jerusalem. While its written form may be later, the substance of the tradition it records was probably formulated in connection with the installation of the ark and its cult in Jerusalem in the time of David or Solomon.[4]

---

[1] Kraus, Worship, p. 111; cf. his comments in Psalmen, I, 372-381, II, 565-568, 660-663, 684-685.

[2] The importance of the Sinai theophany tradition and its association with the ark in the Jerusalem temple cult is especially emphasized by Weiser, Psalms, pp. 38-42, and "Zur Frage nach den Beziehungen der Psalmen zum Kult," pp. 303-321. A. R. Johnson, The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel (2d ed., Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1962), presents an excellent account of the evidence for cultic prophecy as an institution in ancient Israel, both in connection with the Jerusalem temple and royal court and elsewhere. However he does not notice the significance of the ark as a focal point for the reception of oracles.

[3] The original unity of I Sam. 4-6 with II Sam. 6 was first argued by L. Rost, Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids (BWANT, III: 6; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1926), pp. 4-47, and is accepted by Weiser, The Old Testament, p. 162, and Hertzberg, Samuel, pp. 62-63, who both date it to the united monarchy. Von Rad, Theology, I, 44-45, and Kraus, Worship, pp. 181-183, emphasize the importance of this passage as the hieros logos of the cult established by David at Jerusalem.

[4] Hertzberg, Samuel, pp. 62-63, dates it to the reign of David. Fretheim, Ark, pp. 123-124, dates it to the time of Solomon.

The account begins like a holy war story but soon departs from the typical pattern of such stories. The defeat in the first battle is interpreted as an omen that the ark should be brought into the fray from its place at Shiloh so that Yahweh might deliver them (4:3). The entrance of the ark into the camp accompanied by cultic war cries throws the enemy into panic (4:5-8). But at this point the story begins to take a strange and unexpected turn. Instead of victory there is defeat. The sons of Eli are killed in the very company of the ark. Terror and shock at the loss of the ark brings death to Eli and his daughter-in-law (4:10-22).[1] The departure of the ark means the departure of Yahweh, leaving Israel in hopeless despair. Yet the defeat of Israel is only the occasion for Yahweh to manifest his power in marvelous and unexpected ways against the Philistines. The god of the Philistines falls down before the ark and Yahweh afflicts them with plagues comparable to the plagues against the Egyptians (5:1-6:6).[2] Overcome by terror and disgrace, the Philistines are forced to pay homage to Yahweh and to release the ark which Yahweh directs back to Israel as an omen to the Philistines (6:7-14).

The mana-like power associated with the ark continues to be emphasized in the deaths of the men at Bethshemesh (I Sam. 6:19) and of Uzzah (II Sam. 6:6-7), and in the blessing which came to the house of Obed-edom while the ark was there (II Sam. 6:11-12).[1] This mana-like holiness and power, stressed here in an exaggerated way, is also clearly evident in the ark chant (Num. 10:35-36) and the stories of the crossing of the Jordan (Josh. 3-4) and the fall of Jericho (Josh. 6). Likely this is what is meant by the word *^{c}ōz* in the expression *ʼ^{a}rôn* *^{c}uzzekā* in Psalm 132:8 and *^{c}uzzô* in Psalm 78:61.[2] Other occurrences of the word *^{c}ōz* alluding in all probability to the ark occur in Psalm 96:6; cf. I Chronicles 16:27; Psalm 105:4; cf. I Chronicles 16:11; Psalms 81:1; 63:3; 68:29,34-36; 77:15; 21:2,14.[3] Yet, despite its seemingly primitive and semi-magical appearance, this idea is used in these stories to depict the complete sovereignty of Yahweh which neither Israel nor any enemy can control or manipulate. Just as Numbers 10:33-36; 14:39-45 and Joshua 3-4; 6 imply that the ark was the means whereby Yahweh guided Israel from Sinai to the promised land, so I Samuel 4-6, II Samuel 6 indicate that happenings associated with the ark are omens whereby Yahweh demonstrates his abandonment of Shiloh, his rejection of Hophni and Phinehas as custodians of the ark, and his choice of Zion as his dwelling place and David as the primary custodian of the ark.[4]

---

[1] In the context of the preceding stories of prophetic judgment and doom pronounced against the house of Eli this has the appearance of divine retribution. But when chap. 4ff. is considered as a separate unit there is no hint of sin or punishment but only of fearful and inexplicable tragedy. That it was understood in terms of divine punishment and wrath is however indicated in Ps. 78:56-64. Cf. Hertzberg, Samuel, pp. 50-51.

[2] Fretheim, Ark, pp. 120-121, finds a parallelism throughout between the ark story and the exodus story.

---

[1] Pedersen, *Israel*, III-IV, 267-270.

[2] Ps. 132:8 is a chant clearly modeled on the ark chant (Num. 10:35-36) and climaxes a brief poetic recital of the story of David bringing the ark to Jerusalem. Ps. 78:61 occurs in the context of a similar summarizing hymnic recital of the entire ark story beginning with Shiloh and climaxing with Zion.

[3] See Davies, "The Ark in the Psalms," pp. 51-60, "Ark of the Covenant," p. 225, and Fretheim, *Ark*, pp. 16-18, 215-216.

[4] Cf. Kraus, *Worship*, pp. 181-185, and Pss. 132; 78:60-68. For the important point that the story stresses the rejection of Hophni and Phinehas and the choice of David as custodian of the ark I am indebted to a letter from R. B. Y. Scott dated August 3, 1966. Fretheim, *Ark*, pp. 111-124, argues that the story also legitimates the Zadokite priesthood as over against the priestly family of Eli.

D. The Ark and the Divine Title "Yahweh Sabaoth"

In the ark narrative of I Samuel 4-6, II Samuel 6 there is little consistency or pattern in the terminology used to refer to the ark.[1] But the ark is characterized in a more elaborate and revealing way at the two most important turning points in the narrative, first when the ark is removed from Shiloh (I Sam. 4:4), and again when David starts to bring the ark to Jerusalem (II Sam. 6:2). In the first passage it is called *’ᵃrôn yhwh ṣᵉbā’ôt yôšēb hakkᵉrûbîm*.[2] In the second it is characterized still more elaborately as *’ᵃrôn hā’ᵉlôhîm ’ᵃšer-niqrā’ šēm yhwh ṣᵉbā’ôt yôšēb hakkᵉrûbîm ᶜālāyw*.[3] Partly on the basis of these two passages,

---

[1] In the MT the statistics are: *’ᵃrôn yhwh*, eighteen times; *’ᵃrôn hā’ᵉlôhîm*, seventeen times; *’ᵃrôn ’ᵉlōhê yiśrā’ēl*, seven times all attributed to the Philistines; *’ᵃrôn ’ᵉlôhîm*, once; *hā’ārôn*, once; *’ᵃrôn bᵉrît yhwh*, three times; *’ᵃrôn bᵉrît hā’ᵉlôhîm*, once. The rendering of LXX ms. B is equally varied and frequently does not correspond to the MT though about the same range of terminology is used. One may perhaps assume that in an early form of the text *’ᵃrôn yhwh* and *’ᵃrôn hā’ᵉlôhîm* were used interchangeably but that the occurrences of *bᵉrît* are accidental scribal harmonizations with the Deuteronomic usage. None of the four occurrences of *bᵉrît* in the MT has a corresponding *diathēkē* in LXX ms. B, and none of the six occurrences of *diathēkē* in LXX ms. B has a corresponding *bᵉrît* in the MT.

[2] Omitting *bᵉrît* with LXX ms. B but tentatively retaining *ṣᵉbā’ôt* though it is lacking in LXX ms. B. So Hertzberg, *Samuel*, p. 48. S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and Topography of the Books of Samuel* (2d ed., London: Oxford University Press, 1913), p. 46 [cited hereafter as *Samuel*], also omits *ṣᵉbā’ôt*.

[3] Omitting with LXX ms. B one occurrence of the word *šēm* in MT as dittography. So Hertzberg, *Samuel*, p. 275. Driver, *Samuel*, p. 266, also regards *yôšēb kᵉrûbîm* as a gloss but without any basis except the distance between *’ᵃšer* and *ᶜālāyw*. The parallel text in I Chr. 13:6, *’ᵃrôn hā’ᵉlôhîm yhwh yôšēb hakkᵉrûbîm ’ᵃšer-niqrā’ šēm*, is clearly defective and confused in comparison. The attempt by W. R. Arnold, *Ephod and Ark* (Harvard Theological Studies, No. 3; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917), pp. 37-41, cited with approval by Caird, "Samuel," pp. 899, 1077, to explain the phrase *yôšēb hakkᵉrûbîm* in both I Sam. 4:4 and II Sam. 6:2 as a late marginal gloss inserted as a substitute expression for *yhwh*

Eissfeldt has shown that the association of the cherubim with the ark and the association of the term *ṣᵉbāʾôt* with *yhwh* were both cultic developments which originated at Shiloh and were then transferred to Jerusalem.[1] The term *yhwh ṣᵉbāʾôt* first appears in sources referring to the cult at Shiloh (I Sam. 1:3,11; 4:4). It is used in two holy war contexts dealing with the period of Saul (I Sam. 15:2; 17:45, both commonly classified as "Late Source"). More significantly, it is used in a summarizing statement concerning David's growing power concluding the story of his capture of Jerusalem, *wyhwh ʾᵉlôhê ṣᵉbāʾôt ᶜimmô* (II Sam. 5:10, perhaps omitting *ʾᵉlôhê* with LXX ms. B). Its association with the Jerusalem cult is emphasized by its occurrence in the last part of the ark story (II Sam. 6:2,18) and in Nathan's oracle (II Sam. 7:7,8) and the following prayer ascribed to David (7:26,27).

The expression *yôsēb hakkᵉrûbîm* first occurs in close connection with the ark and with *yhwh ṣᵉbāʾôt* in the two passages from the ark story mentioned above (I Sam. 4:4; II Sam. 6:2). In the much later context of a story from the time of Sennacherib's threat to Jerusalem, Hezekiah addresses a prayer to *yhwh* (*ṣᵉbāʾôt* ?) *ʾᵉlôhê yiśrāʾēl yôšēb hakkᵉrûbîm* in the presence of the ark (II Kgs. 19:15 = Is. 37:16).[2] In Psalm 80, a

---

ṣᵉbāʾôt is unnecessary and seems typical of Arnold's tendency to solve all problems connected with the ark and the ephod by means of textual emendations.

[1] O. Eissfeldt, "Jahwe Zebaoth" (1950), *KS*, III, 103-123. The discussion below is based primarily upon pp. 113-117; cf. also Eissfeldt, "Silo und Jerusalem." Similar views are expressed by Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 201, de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 259, 299, 305, von Rad, *Theology*, I, 18, Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 33-34, and B. W. Anderson, "Hosts, Host of Heaven," *IDB*, II, 655; cf. A. Alt, "Gedanken über das Königtum Jahwes" (1945), *KS*, I, 349-355, and Fretheim, *Ark*, pp. 26-28.

[2] The MT in Kings lacks the word *ṣᵉbāʾôt* though it is present in the MT text of Isaiah and also in the Kings text of LXX ms. L and the Syriac

communal lament, the opening appeal is directed to Yahweh as *yôšēb hakk^{e}rûbîm* (vs. 2) and the repeated appeals in the refrain are addressed to *yhwh ṣ^{e}bāʼôt* (vss. 4,8,15,20 and also 5).[1] Psalm 99:1-2, a psalm of Yahweh's kingship, uses the phrase *yôšēb k^{e}rûbîm* in synonymous parallelism with the proclamation *yhwh mālāk* with the words *yhwh b^{e}ṣiyyôn gādôl* following in the next line. Similar to this in another psalm of Yahweh's kingship is Psalm 47:9, *mālak ʼ^{e}lōhîm ^{c}al-gôyîm* / *ʼ^{e}lōhîm yāšab ^{c}al-kissēʼ qodšô* (*ʼ^{e}lōhîm* perhaps an Elohistic substitute for *yhwh*). Especially noteworthy is the use of the title *yhwh ṣ^{e}bāʼôt* in Psalm 24:10 in the context of a chant that almost certainly accompanied a procession of the ark into the temple. Here this title is one of a series of honorific titles for Yahweh which includes *melek hakkābôd*, *yhwh ^{c}izzûz w^{e}gibbôr*, and *yhwh gibbôr milḥāmâ*, showing a close connection between the tradition of Yahweh as the God of holy war and Yahweh as king, both ideas here obviously associated with the ark.[2]

The title *yhwh ṣ^{e}bāʼôt* occurs with greatest frequency in the Isaianic literature.[3] Most notably, it occurs in close connection with

---

(*BH*). That the prayer takes place in the presence of the ark is almost certainly indicated by what Hezekiah is said to have done with the letter containing the Assyrian ultimatum, *wayya^{c}al bêt yhwh wayyipr^{e}śēhû ḥizqiyyāhû lipnê yhwh*, *wayyitpallēl ḥizqiyyāhû lipnê yhwh* (II Kgs. 19:14b-15a = Is. 37:14b-15 which reads *ʼel-yhwh* for the second *lipnê yhwh*).

[1] The word *ʼ^{e}lōhîm* in vss. 5,8,15,20 is obviously due to incomplete "Elohistic" redaction. In vs. 4 *yhwh ṣ^{e}bāʼôt* can probably be read on the analogy of the other verses. So Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 555.

[2] Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 201, 206.

[3] The term occurs approximately 62 times in the book of Isaiah, based on counting the references listed in S. Mandelkern, *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae* (2 vols.; reprinted, Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1955), II, 982-983. Distributed throughout most of the major strata of the book except Is. 56-66, these occurrences seem to be most frequent in genuine Isaianic material and in Deutero-Isaiah.

the portrayal of Yahweh as king in the theophany vision of Isaiah 6:1-5 which presupposes symbolism associated with the ark and cherubim in the Solomonic temple.[1] In contrast to Isaiah, the title probably occurred only seldom in Jeremiah.[2] It does not occur at all in Deuteronomy or Ezekiel but is frequent in Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi.[3]

These passages indicate that important antecedents of the idea of Yahweh as king were rooted in the Yahwistic ark and cherubim cult at Shiloh and were introduced to Jerusalem in connection with the ark in the time of David. At Jerusalem the idea of Yahweh as king was closely associated with the title *yhwh ṣᵉbā’ôt* and with the idea of his enthronement on the cherubim (Pss. 24:7-10; 99:1; Isaiah 6:1-5).[4] Unfortunately the origin, syntactical structure and meaning of the title *yhwh ṣᵉbā’ôt* are still unsolved problems. Ringgren lists no less than five significantly different explanations of the meaning of *ṣᵉbā’ôt* in this title, none of which can be adopted with confidence over the others.[1] Eissfeldt argues that *ṣ^{e}bā'ôt* was originally the name or title of a Canaanite deity worshipped at the pre-Israelite sanctuary of Shiloh.[2] Cross suggests that it originated as an epithet of El, which he reconstructs as *ḏu yahwī ṣaba'ōt*, "He who creates the (heavenly) armies."[3] But this is admittedly quite tentative. The important point remains, therefore, that *yhwh ṣ^{e}bā'ôt*, when it first becomes known to us as a divine title at Shiloh and as it continues to be used at Jerusalem, is predominantly associated with holy war and the enthronement of Yahweh in connection with the ark and the cherubim. Its most enduring connotation was sovereignty and power, as indicated by the LXX renderings *kyrios pantokratōr* and *kyrios tōn dynameōn*.[4]

---

[1] These occurrences are at the two climactic points in the account of the vision, the chant of the seraphim, *qādôš qādôš qādôš yhwh ṣᵉbā’ôt / mᵉlô’ kol-hā’āreṣ kᵉbôdô* (vs. 3), and the conclusion of Isaiah's confession of unworthiness, *kî ’et-hammelek yhwh ṣᵉbā’ôt rā’û ᶜênāy* (vs. 5). The words *wā’er’eh ’et-yhwh yôšēb ᶜal-kissē’ rām wᵉniśśā’* (vs. 1, reading *yhwh* with about 100 mss. rather than *’ᵃdônāy*; cf. *BH*) are clearly reminiscent of the phrase *yôšēb hakkᵉrûbîm* discussed above.

[2] This statement is based on Eissfeldt, "Jahwe Zebaoth," p. 122, who points out that although the term occurs 62 times in the MT of Jeremiah in the context of oracular formulas such as *kôh-’āmar yhwh ṣᵉbā’ôt*, it is lacking in all but six or seven cases in the corresponding text of the LXX. A similar situation appears to be the case with occurrences of the term in other contexts in Jeremiah.

[3] For further statistics on the use of the term and its variants see L. Koehler, *Old Testament Theology*, tr. A. S. Todd (London: Lutterworth Press, 1957), pp. 49-51.

[4] On these connections see Alt, "Gedanken über das Königtum Jahwes," pp. 349-355.

E. The Storm Theophany and Throne Symbolism of the Cherubim

The Canaanite background of the cherubim as cultic symbols associated with the ark is more clear. Canaanite and Syrian artifacts have been found representing winged sphinxlike figures guarding or supporting both the thrones of deities and of human kings.[1] This confirms recent reviews of the biblical evidence indicating that the throne symbolism of the ark at Shiloh and Jerusalem was actually associated more directly with the cherubim than with the ark itself.[2] No clue to their symbolic and cultic significance is given in the account of the construction of the cherubim and their placement within the inner sanctuary of the temple (I Kgs. 6:23-28; cf. II Chr. 3:10-13). The most plausible suggestion is that the cherubim represented the throne of Yahweh and the ark his footstool.[3] This is indicated in I Chronicles 28:2 where *h^{a}dôm raglê ʼ^{e}lôhênû* is used explicitly as a synonymous parallel of *ʼ^{a}rôn b^{e}rît-yhwh*. Probable allusions to the ark as Yahweh's footstool in earlier texts occur in Psalm 99:5 (*w^{e}hištaḥ^{a}wû lah^{a}dôm raglāyw*), 132:7 (*ništaḥ^{a}weh lah^{a}dôm*

---

[1] H. Ringgren, *Israelite Religion*, tr. D. E. Green (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), pp. 68-69. Similar summaries of various viewpoints are given by Eissfeldt, "Jahwe Zebaoth," pp. 107-110, Eichrodt, *Theology*, I, 192-194, and Anderson, "Hosts, Host of Heaven," p. 655.

[2] "Jahwe Zebaoth," pp. 120-121, followed by Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 34, 38-39; cf. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, p. 304. The main support for this view is the analogy with the acknowledged adoption of Canaanite divine names such as *'ēl ^{c}elyôn*, *'ēl šadday* and *'ēl ^{c}ôlām* as titles for Yahweh. But an analogous expression *'ēl ṣ^{e}bā'ôt* or *ṣ^{e}bā'ôt* used independently as a divine title never occurs. Likewise, combinations such as *yhwh ^{c}elyôn*, *yhwh šadday* and *yhwh ^{c}ôlām* analogous in structure to *yhwh ṣ^{e}bā'ōt* do not occur except rarely *yhwh ^{c}elyôn* (Pss. 7:18; 47:7; cf. 57:3; 78:56) where *^{c}elyôn* is adjacent to *yhwh* by coincidence rather than in its more usual position in synonymous parallelism or independently as an honorific title for Yahweh.

[3] F. M. Cross Jr., "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *Harvard Theological Review*, LV (1962), 250-256.

[4] Eissfeldt, "Jahwe Zebaoth," pp. 103-105; cf. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, p. 304.

---

[1] For a full discussion see R. de Vaux, "Les chérubins et l'arche d'alliance: Les sphinx gardiens et les trônes divins dans l'ancien Orient," *Mélanges de l'université Saint Joseph*, XXXVII (1961), 91-124; cf. Clements, *God and Temple*, p. 32. Brief discussions include de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 299-300, 319, W. F. Albright, "What Were the Cherubim?" (1938), *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, ed. D. N. Freedman and G. E. Wright (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1961), pp. 95-98, O. Eissfeldt, "Zur Deutung von Motiven auf den 1937 gefundenen phönizschen Elfenbeinarbeiten von Megiddo" (1950), *KS*, III, 85-89, G. E. Wright, *Biblical Archaeology* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957), pp. 74, 94, 141, J. Gray, *I & II Kings: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), pp. 161-163, and Eichrodt, *Theology*, II, 202-205.

[2] Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 28-31, convincingly summarizes the arguments against the long accepted view of M. Dibelius, *Die Lade Jahves: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (FRLANT, 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1906), that the ark itself was basically a throne symbol. See also J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings*, ed. H. S. Gehman (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1951), pp. 155-156, M. Haran, "The Ark and the Cherubim: Their Symbolic Significance in Biblical Ritual," *Israel Exploration Journal*, IX (1959), 30-38, 89-94, and Fretheim, *Ark*, pp. 222-229.

[3] This is argued by de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 299-300, and Fretheim, *Ark*, pp. 229-240. See also Jer. 3:16-17; Ezek. 43:7 and Is. 60:13; 66:1, passages which deal with the restoration of the temple as the place of the ark with its throne and footstool symbolism.

raglāyw), and probably Lamentations 2:1 (*w^{e}lô’-zākar h^{a}dôm-raglāyw b^{e}yôm ’appô*). This combination of two probably unrelated cult objects likely took place first at Shiloh and was then perpetuated in the Solomonic temple.

Functioning as a throne symbol, the cherubim probably represented the storm cloud as Yahweh's heavenly chariot and the primary means of his theophany visitations, thus showing the connection between the ark and the cherubim and the holy war theophany tradition.[1] This is indicated most clearly in the magnificent storm theophany portrayed with many cosmic overtones in Psalm 18:8-16 = II Samuel 22:8-16. The psalm pictures Yahweh's descent from heaven in the midst of storm clouds, riding and flying on a cherub (*wayyirkab ^{c}al-k^{e}rûb w^{e}yā^{c}ôp*, vs. 11). As used here in the context of a royal psalm of thanksgiving, the theophany recital portrays Yahweh's awesome intervention from the temple in response to the king's prayer in order to deliver him in a great holy war victory over many enemies (vss. 7,17-20,32-46).[2]

Although there are no other references to Yahweh riding on a cherub, he is given the title *rôkēb bā^{ca}rābôt* in Psalm 68:5 which appears to correspond to the title *rkb ^{c}rpt*, "rider of the clouds," applied frequently to Baal in the Ugaritic texts.[1] The preceding context (vss. 2-3) has theophany-like expressions associated with the ark chant of Numbers 10:35. The following context (vss. 8-11) portrays a storm theophany connected specifically with Sinai in a passage which closely parallels Judges 5:4-5.[2] The similar title, *rôkeb bišmê š^{e}mê qedem* (vs. 34), occurs in the concluding hymnic call to praise in the context of repeated references to Yahweh's *^{c}ōz*, a term which, as noted above, seems often to allude to the ark. Here Yahweh's *^{c}ōz* manifests itself in close connection with the temple at Jerusalem (vss. 29-30,34-36). The immediate contexts of these theophany descriptions and much of the rest of the psalm are permeated with holy war allusions (vss. 2-4,12-15,18-19,22-24).

---

[1] The thesis that the kapporeth and carved cherubim, placed above the ark according to the Priestly tradition of the Pentateuch (Ex. 25:10-22, etc.), symbolized the cloud in which Yahweh appeared to Israel according to the Sinai and desert traditions was advanced by N. H. Torczyner, *Die Bundeslade und die Anfänge der Religion Israels* (2. Aufl., Berlin: Philo Verlag, 1930), pp. 23ff.; cf. Eichrodt, *Theology*, I, 109. This view of the significance of the cherubim and ark has been adopted and developed further by Weiser, "Zur Frage nach den Beziehungen der Psalmen zum Kult," pp. 308-313, and *Psalms*, pp. 38-42. A similar view is expressed by Clements, *God and Temple*, p. 35, who says the cherubim symbol was probably just an embellishment of the already existing Sinai theophany tradition.

[2] On the unity of this psalm which has often been called into question see Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 140-141, and Weiser, *Psalms*, pp. 186-187. On its antiquity see F. M. Cross Jr. and D. N. Freedman, "A Royal Psalm of Thanksgiving: II Samuel 22 = Psalm 18," *JBL*, LXXII (1953), 16-20.

In another archaic psalm, Deuteronomy 33, almost the same hymnic participle construction, *rôkēb šāmayim* (vs. 26), is applied to *'ēl*, referring in context to Yahweh, in a hymnic conclusion which harks back to the opening hymnic recital of the Sinai theophany and covenant and to the theme of Yahweh's kingship (vss. 2-5).[3] The occurrence of the divine name *'ēl* with *rôkēb šāmayim* perhaps confirms the Canaanite origin of the expression. Although no clear allusion to the ark occurs here, the similarity to the Psalm 68 passages just mentioned is notable.[1] Holy war allusions in the closing part of the psalm refer especially to the conquest of Canaan as a divine act (vss. 27b-29). Similar theophany and storm cloud imagery is assimilated to a hymnic picture of creation in Psalm 104:1-4. Here, too, Yahweh is represented as riding on the storm clouds (*haśśām-ᶜābîm rᵉkûbô* / *hamᵉhallēk ᶜal-kanpê-rûaḥ*, Ps. 104:3)[2] in terms reminiscent of his riding on the *kᵉrûb* (Ps. 18:11).

---

[1] *UM*, 51:III:11,18; 51:V:122; 67:II:7; 1 *Aqht*:43-44; *^{c}nt*:II:40. Cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 466, 472.

[2] The deletion of the words *zeh sînay* (vs. 9) as a gloss by Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 467, and other commentators is unjustified in light of the parallel in Jud. 5:5. The explanation of this use of *zeh* on the analogy of Arabic *dū* (*KB*) and the translation "Lord of Sinai" are entirely plausible, especially since both these archaic psalms have many other linguistic peculiarities as well. Cf. Clements, *God and Temple*, p. 24.

[3] The dating of this poem to the tenth century is argued especially by F. M. Cross Jr. and D. N. Freedman, "The Blessing of Moses," *JBL*, LXVII (1948), 191-210. Cf. G. E. Wright, "The Book of Deuteronomy: Introduction and Exegesis," *IB*, II (1953), 527-534.

These passages from some of the most archaic psalms preserved in the Old Testament show the assimilation of Canaanite storm-god symbolism and imagery into the hymnic representation of Yahweh's theophany manifestations.[3] This assimilation, including the adoption of the cherubim as cult symbols, must have already taken place in pre-Davidic times. But, as assimilated, the cherubim became primarily associated with the hymnic theophany tradition. Both were used especially in the hymnic celebration of Israel's holy war faith and contributed to the development of the theme of Yahweh's kingship.[1]

---

[1] To Deut. 33:26, *'ên kā'ēl yᵉšûrûn* / *rôkēb šāmayim bᵉᶜezrekā* / *ûbᵉga'ᵃwātô šᵉḥāqîm*, compare Ps. 68:34-35, *lārôkēb bišmê šᵉmê-qedem* / *hēn yittēn bᵉqôlô qôl ᶜōz* / *tᵉnû ᶜōz lē'lôhîm* / *ᶜāl-yiśrā'ēl ga'ᵃwātô* / *wᵉᶜuzzô baššᵉḥāqîm*. It seems clear that Deut. 33:36 resumes the thought of vs. 5, especially the words *wayᵉhî bîšûrûn melek*.

[2] Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 710, suggests that *kanpê-rûaḥ* here points to the winged cherubim as personifications of the wind especially since the next verse refers to the winds as Yahweh's messengers (*ᶜōśeh mal'ākāyw rûḥôt*, vs. 4a). Carrying the suggestion further he connects the parallel expression *mᵉšārᵉtāyw 'ēš lôhēṭ* (vs. 4b) with the *śᵉrāpîm* of Is. 6:2-3. Although there is no direct textual evidence one can make a plausible case for emending the word *rᵉkûbô* in vs. 3 to *kᵉrûbô*. The word *rᵉkûb* is unknown outside this passage. In the closely similar verse, Ps. 18:11, *kᵉrûb* rather than *rᵉkûb* does stand as the synonymous parallel of *kanpê-rûaḥ*.

[3] On both the antiquity of these psalms and their importance for understanding the Sinai theophany tradition see Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 22-26.

The connection between such hymnic theophany passages and holy war has been confirmed by quite a different approach in a careful form-critical study by Jörg Jeremias.[2] He maintains that such passages constitute a distinct and well-defined *Gattung* which had its original *Sitz im Leben* in premonarchic victory songs of the type best represented by the Song of Deborah (Jud. 5).[3] He reconstructs the primary form of the *Gattung* from Judges 5:4-5 and Psalm 68:8-9 in comparison with Deuteronomy 33:2, Habakkuk 3:3, Micah 1:3-4, Amos 1:2, Psalm 46:7 and Isaiah 63:19b. In structure it has two parts, the first depicting the coming of Yahweh from Sinai and the second the catastrophic response of nature in the form of earthquakes, downpours of rain and the like.[4] He attributes the first element to the Sinai theophany tradition and the second to Canaanite and other non-Israelite sources.[5] However he does not notice the close connection of many of these hymnic theophany passages with allusions to the ark and cherubim as cult theophany symbols.[6] Thus he misses the continued association of theophany language and holy war theology with the Davidic dynasty and the kingship of Yahweh at Zion.

---

[1] Cf. Fretheim, *Ark*, pp. 240-247, and Cross, "The Divine Warrior," pp. 17-18, 27-28.

[2] *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung* (WMANT, 10; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1965).

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 1-6, 136-150.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 7-16. On p. 11 he offers the following reconstruction of the earliest traceable oral-tradition form of the *Gattung* based on Jud. 5:4-5 and Ps. 68:8-9:

yhwh bṣ'tk mś^{c}yr / bṣ^{c}dk mśdh 'dwm
'rṣ r^{c}šh gm šmym nṭpw / mpny yhwh zh syny

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 73-90, 100-111, 151-157.

[6] He sees a direct allusion to the ark only in Is. 33:3, *Ibid.*, pp. 111-112. He makes no serious attempt to connect the ark and cherubim

The imagery and symbolism of the hymnic theophany tradition continued to be used in many ways in the Psalms and prophetic literature. Isaiah uses the imagery of Yahweh riding on a cloud in an oracle of doom portraying Yahweh descending upon Egypt in a theophany of judgment (*hinnēh* *yhwh* *rôkēb* *ᶜal-ᶜāb* *qal* *ûbā'* *miṣrayim*, Is. 19:1).[1] In this passage there is again no allusion to the ark or cherubim. But in Ezekiel the cherubim and their theophany symbolism play a major role. This is especially clear in chapters 8-11 which portray the doom of Jerusalem in a visionary account of the departure of the cherubim throne and the glory of Yahweh from the temple and the city. The *kᵉbôd* *yhwh* rests upon the cherubim but may rise up and depart from them or return to them at will (9:3; 10:4,18-19; 11:22-23). Furthermore, a cloud accompanies the *kᵉbôd* *yhwh* and the cherubim (10:3-4), and clearly the cherubim constitute a throne symbol (10:1). Though the cherubim are not mentioned explicitly in the opening vision of the book (chap. 1), the great storm cloud theophany and the description of the heavenly throne chariot draw upon the traditional theophany and throne symbolism associated with them.[2] The same theophany symbolism is also evident in the portrayal of the return of the *kᵉbôd* *yhwh* to the temple in 43:1-5.

---

symbolism with the picture of Yahweh riding on a cherub in Ps. 18:11, though he does connect this with the theophany picture of Yahweh riding on a cloud as his war chariot, p. 37; cf. pp. 70-71, 162.

[1] Cf. Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 17, 88, 159-160.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 62, 64-65, 135-136, 162-163.

F. The Ark and the Jerusalem "Name" Theology

The expression *’^{a}rôn* *hā’^{e}lōhîm* *’^{a}šer-niqrā’* *šēm* *yhwh* *ṣ^{e}bā’ôt* *^{c}ālāyw* in II Samuel 6:2 is also an important clue to the origin and development of the so-called *šēm* theology in the Jerusalem cultic tradition.[1] It indicates that the ark and cherubim constituted the focal point for the invocation of the *šēm* *yhwh* *s^{e}bā’ôt* representing his powerful presence and blessing as illustrated in verse 18. In Psalm 68:5 in the context of frequent allusions to the ark and its symbolism, *š^{e}mô* occurs in a hymnic line with the Canaanite theophany title *rôkēb* *ba^{ca}rābôt* as its synonymous parallel. In the hymnic summons of Psalm 29:1b-2a *k^{e}bôd* *š^{e}mô* is used in synonymous parallelism with *kābôd* *wā^{c}ōz*, indicating that *šēm* as well as *^{c}ōz* and *kābôd* began to be used at an early period to refer to Yahweh's sovereignty and power symbolized cultically by the ark at Zion. The stereotyped and traditional character of these hymnic lines is shown by their recurrence in Psalm 96:7-8 in connection with the hymnic celebration of Yahweh's kingship as symbolized by the ark and cherubim. This tends to cast doubt upon the sharp distinction drawn by von Rad between the Deuteronomic *šēm* theology and the *kābôd* theology of Ezekiel and the Priestly tradition. In Psalm 76:2, a song of Zion, *š^{e}mô* occurs in close connection with hymnic references to Yahweh's dwelling in Zion and his holy war defense of Zion. In Psalm 89:25 *š^{e}mî* occurs in an oracle promising holy war victory to the king in the context of a theophany passage reflecting symbolism associated with the ark. Psalms 20 and 21 both deal with the theme of Yahweh giving the king victory in battle. Psalm 21:2, 14 uses the word *^{c}ōz* to refer to the holy war power symbolized by the ark, whereas Psalm 20:2,6,8 uses the word *šēm* in about the same way. That references to Yahweh's *šēm* allude to the ark and its symbolism is confirmed by Jeremiah 7:12, an oracle which refers to the former location of the ark at Shiloh in the words *m^{e}qômî ʼ^{a}šer b^{e}šîlô ʼ^{a}šer šākantî š^{e}mî šām*. The same significance is evident in Isaiah 18:7, a post-Isaianic promise referring to Mt. Zion as *m^{e}qôm šēm-yhwh ṣ^{e}bāʼôt*. This list of passages indicates that the Deuteronomic *šēm* theology represented a reinterpretation of the traditional symbolism of the ark. This is most clearly evident in the Deuteronomic prayer of Solomon inserted in the context of the story of the installation of the ark in the temple, I Kings 8:15-53; cf. Deuteronomy 12:5,11,21; 14:23-24; 16:2,6,11; 26:2.

---

[1] This development is a topic of such wide scope that only a few notable passages can be touched upon here. For helpful surveys of the theological usage of the word *šēm* in the Old Testament and later Judaism see H. Bietenhard, "*onoma, onomazō, eponomazō, pseudōnymos*," *TWNT*, V (1954), 251-269, and Eichrodt, *Theology*, II, 40-45. The association of this theme with the ark is noted especially by Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 158-164. Cf. Pss. 20:2,6,8; 29:2; Isa. 30:27, and Fretheim, *Ark*, pp. 28-29.

G. The Shiloh Ark Cult as Reflected in the Priestly Ark and Tabernacle Tradition

This brings us to the last and most difficult question, namely the relationship of the ark to the tabernacle and the significance of the Priestly traditions of the Pentateuch concerning them. G. von Rad has argued at length that the earliest ark traditions and tent traditions had no connection with one another and that they represented two quite different and incompatible ways of conceiving the presence of Yahweh.[1] The older ark traditions represent a theology of Yahweh constantly present and dwelling with Israel. The tent traditions reflect a theology of

---

[1] *Studies in Deuteronomy*, tr. D. Stalker (SBT, 9; Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1953), pp. 37-44, *Theology*, I, 234-241, and "Zelt und Lade."

Yahweh manifesting himself from time to time in temporary theophanic visitations represented by the cloud meeting Moses at the door of the tent of meeting (*’ōhel mô^{c}ēd*, Ex. 33:7-11; Num. 11:16,24-26; 12:4; Deut. 31: 14-15, which he classes as E passages). Deuteronomic theology then suppressed the throne symbolism of the ark in favor of an emphasis on Yahweh dwelling in heaven, his earthly presence being manifest only by his *šēm* which he has placed at his sanctuary. The ark is therefore demythologized by Deuteronomy into simply a container for the tablets of the law (Deut. 10:1-5, I Kgs. 8:9). The Priestly Document, representing "a theoretical recasting of the old traditions," combines the ark as a container for the covenant law with the tent, but stresses the visitation theology associated with the tent tradition using the technical term *k^{e}bôd yhwh* for his theophanic self-manifestations.

In the light of the preceding discussion of the ark and cherubim as a theophany symbol this sharp distinction between a "presence" theology and a "visitation" theology seems artificial and rigid. Instead the ark and cherubim as well as the tent were connected with a theophany "visitation" theology and cult.[1] This undermines much of the basis for von Rad's argument that the connection between the ark and the tabernacle was mainly a theological fiction of the postexilic Priestly tradition. Psalm 61:5, which von Rad cites in support of the earlier separateness of the tent theology, actually places *b^e’oholkā* in synonymous parallelism with *b^{e}sēter k^{e}nāpeykā*, a probable allusion to the ark and cherubim.[2]

---

[1] So especially Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 37-38, 63-64. Beyerlin, *Sinaitic Traditions*, pp. 112-118, argues effectively that the ark is presupposed along with the tent in Ex. 33:1-7, the passage upon which von Rad especially bases his contention that the tent alone was originally a theophany visitation shrine.

[2] Von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, p. 44.

Several recent discussions challenge this longstanding literary-critical view that the Priestly tabernacle is primarily a fictitious backward projection of the Solomonic temple, and attempt to find its basis in a genuine pre-Solomonic tradition. M. Haran, for example, argues that the P account of the ark and tabernacle is essentially the sacred legend of the Shiloh sanctuary as handed down and recast at Jerusalem.[1] In a similar vein, G. H. Davies suggests that the Priestly tabernacle account reflects the tent David set up for the ark at Jerusalem (II Sam. 6:17). But he thinks this was, in turn, a revival of the Mosaic tradition of the Shiloh sanctuary, which was itself a permanent structure built to replace the original portable tent when that was worn out.[2] Eissfeldt thinks that the Solomonic temple and especially the cherubim in the holy of holies were patterned after the Shiloh sanctuary, although he rejects the Priestly tabernacle as evidence.[3] Fretheim believes the portable

---

[1] "Shiloh and Jerusalem: The Origin of the Priestly Tradition in the Pentateuch," *JBL*, LXXXI (1962), 14-24. He maintains that the strong emphasis on the divine impartation of the plan and on the solemn and careful way it was carried out show that the tradition regarded it as a permanent and everlasting structure rather than a provisional pattern for some other later shrine (Ex. 25-29, 35-40). The P narrative emphasizes that after the entrance into Canaan the tabernacle was set up at Shiloh (Josh. 18-19, 21). There is no mention of it ever being moved again except for the Priestly gloss saying it was brought to Solomon's temple (I Kgs. 8:4). The references in non-Priestly sources to a *bêt yhwh* (I Sam. 1:7,24; cf. Jud. 18:31) or *hêkal yhwh* (I Sam. 3:8) at Shiloh are anachronistic in the light of Nathan's oracle which emphasizes that Yahweh had always before moved about *b^{e}'ōel ûb^{e}miškān* (II Sam. 7:6-7). Note also the reference in a non-Priestly source to Eli's sons serving at the *'ōhel mô^{c}ēd* in Shiloh (I Sam. 2:22).

[2] "Tabernacle," *IDB*, IV, 505b-506a. F. M. Cross Jr., "The Priestly Tabernacle" (1947), *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, pp. 213-214, 221-223, also regards the Priestly tabernacle as a reflection of David's tent sanctuary.

[3] "Jahwe Zebaoth," pp. 117-118, 121, and "Silo und Jerusalem," pp. 423-424.

Priestly ark and tabernacle sanctuary represent an exilic restoration program opposed to the rebuilding of the temple but using ancient traditions deriving from Shiloh.[1] The use of the terms *miškān* and *'ōhel* in the Psalms to refer to the Solomonic temple may likewise reflect the survival of terminology originally referring to the tent sanctuary.[2] The close connection between the Shiloh sanctuary and David's tent sanctuary is further supported by the fact that Abiathar, who joined David as his priestly advisor during David's rise to power and who continued as one of his most important and trusted court officials, was connected with the Priestly family from Shiloh.[3] The cumulative weight of these various arguments justifies a tentative use of the Priestly discussion of the ark as supporting evidence for determining the traditional significance attached to the ark when it was at Shiloh and when it was later brought to Jerusalem by David and installed in the temple by Solomon.

---

[1] *Ark*, pp. 79-84, 96-99.

[2] In Ps. 78:60 *miškān* refers explicitly to the Shiloh sanctuary; cf. II Sam. 7:6 = I Chr. 17:3, and the verb *škn* (piel) in Jer. 7:12. It refers to the Jerusalem temple in Pss. 26:8; 43:3; 46:5; 74:7; 84:2; 132:5, 7; cf. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 177.

[3] On Abiathar's early role as David's priestly advisor see I Sam. 22:20-23; 23:6-9; 30:7. On his position in David's court see II Sam. 8:17 (emending to *w^{e}'ebyātār ben-'^{a}ḥîmelek* with Syriac; cf. *BH* and 20:25); 15:24-29,35-36; 17:15; 19:12; 20:25; I Kgs. 1-2 passim; cf. 4:4. On his role in connection with the ark see II Sam. 15:24-29. The connection of Abiathar with the house of Eli is known mainly from the Deuteronomic editorial note in I Kgs. 2:27 which interprets Solomon's removal of Abiathar as a fulfillment of the prophecy against the house of Eli in I Sam. 2:27-36. This connection is strengthened by the possible identity of the Ahitub mentioned in I Sam. 14:3 as a member of the house of Eli with the Ahitub mentioned in 22:20 (cf. vss. 9,11-12) as the father of Ahimelech the father of Abiathar at Nob. The reliability of this connection is sometimes doubted as for example by R. W. Corney in his articles "Abiathar," *IDB*, I, 6b-7a, "Abimelech," *IDB*, I, 70, "Ahitub," *IDB*, I, 71, and "Eli," *IDB*, II, 85, who regards both I Sam. 14:3 and I Kgs. 2:27 as Deuteronomic inventions designed to provide a fulfillment for the words of I Sam. 2:35-36 which is itself a Deuteronomic construction alluding to the fate of Abiathar. But it is difficult to see why the Deuteronomic editor would have made such an elaborate yet not entirely explicit editorial construction if it were not in fact known that Abiathar was connected with the house of Eli. On the possible identity of Ahijah, son of Ahitub (I Sam. 14:3) with Ahimelech, father of Abiathar, see F. T. Schumacher, "Ahijah," *IDB*, I, 67.

Most important for purposes of this discussion are the *kappōret* and paired *k^{e}rûbîm* figures placed above the ark (Ex. 25:17-22; 26:34; 30:6; 37:6-9; 40:20). This is mentioned repeatedly in lists as a separate item of furniture closely associated with the ark (Ex. 31:7; 35:12; 39:35). Although commentators often assume that it was simply a lid placed directly on top of the ark, this is not self-evident from the texts themselves.[1] The language used could equally well mean that it was supported in some other way above the ark rather than lying directly on top of it.[2] In either case it functioned as a cult object distinct and yet inseparable from the ark.[3] From above the kapporeth between the two cherubim

---

[1] For example Noth, *Exodus*, p. 204, makes this assumption almost without discussion.

[2] The usual expression is simply *^{c}al-'^{a}rôn hā^{c}ēdût* (Ex. 26:34; Num. 7:89), *^{c}al-hā^{c}ēdût* (Ex. 30:6; Lev. 16:13), or *^{c}al-hā'ārôn* (Lev. 16:2). But in the passage where the instructions concerning its construction are given in detail and again in the passage where the actual setting up of the equipment is recounted the expression is *^{c}al-hā'ārôn mil^{e}ma^{c}lâ* (Ex. 25:21; 40:20). The expression *mil^{e}ma^{c}lâ* can mean "above" without meaning literally "on top of" and is so used to refer to the wings of the cherubim overshadowing the ark in Solomon's temple (I Kgs. 8:7; II Chr. 5:8; cf. Ezek. 1:22). Likewise *^{c}al* can express the idea of being suspended above something; cf. *BH*, definition 5. The meaning of the word *kappōret* is not at all certain. The commonly suggested rendering "lid" or "cover" is based on the verb *kpr* in the sense of "cover" and on the assumption that the *kappōret* was laid directly on top of the ark. This rendering is accepted by *GB* and *KB* though rejected by *BDB*. The LXX rendering *hilastērion* and the traditional English rendering "mercy seat" are based on the meaning "atone" of the verb *kpr* and on the ritual in Lev. 16. This meaning is accepted by J. Herrmann, "*hilastērion*," *TWNT*, III (1938), 319-320, and J. C. Rylaarsdam, "The Book of Exodus: Introduction and Exegesis," *IB*, I (1952), 1023.

[3] So Haran, "The Ark and Cherubim," pp. 32-35, who argues that the cherubim symbolize a throne and that the ark is the footstool. Cf. Clements, *God and Temple*, p. 31, and Weiser, "Zur Frage nach den Beziehungen der Psalmen zum Kult," pp. 310, 312.

Yahweh meets Moses to tell him what to communicate to Israel (Ex. 25:22; 30:6; Num. 7:89). The instructions for the day of atonement show how Yahweh's presence was conceived. Here he is said to appear in a cloud over the kapporeth (*be^{c}ānān ʼērāʼeh ^{c}al-hakkappōret*, Lev. 16:2). The cultic symbol for this is the cloud of incense with which Aaron is to cover the kapporeth to protect himself (Lev. 16:13). Though highly stereotyped, these traditions confirm two points already mentioned. As a throne-like symbol the kapporeth and cherubim above the ark indicate the focal point for the cultic theophany appearance of Yahweh shrouded in smoke.[1] At the same time they constitute a focal point for oracular communication to Israel through a prophet-like mediator. Though the evidence is rather tenuous, Beyerlin thinks that something corresponding to the kapporeth existed in the Solomonic temple and that it is related to the sky-like sapphire platform under the feet of God in the Sinai theophany tradition of Exodus 24:10 and to the shining crystal-like firmament under the throne in the theophany symbolism of Ezekiel 1:22,26; 10:1.[2]

H. Summary

This survey has shown that quite a number of significant ideas and themes must have been associated with the ark and the accompanying cherubim throne at the beginning of the monarchy. One must avoid the temptation to unify all these too rigidly into one single theological theme or cultic pattern. This could be done only by inferring one dominant idea or pattern inductively from a few passages and then applying it deductively to other passages where it could not be inferred inductively. The most obvious unifying factor in the passages discussed is the ark and cherubim combination itself as a traditional and highly revered cult object and symbol. The variety of traditions, ideas and cultic practices associated with them and handed on from generation to generation need not necessarily form a completely consistent and logically coherent whole. Instead one must assume that there are both elements of continuity on the one hand that make for unity and fresh innovations or newly assimilated elements on the other hand that make for complexity. A summary should, therefore, enumerate the variety of themes associated with the ark and cherubim without attempting to force them into one logically integrated whole based upon one all-pervasive underlying or "original" meaning or function. At the same time it should try to point out the elements of genuine continuity along with innovations and assimilations.

---

[1] Cf. Pedersen, *Israel*, III-IV, 246-247.

[2] *Sinaitic Traditions*, p. 32; cf. Pedersen, *Israel*, III-IV, 247-249.

The most clearly evident element of continuity in the passages discussed is the role of the ark as a symbol of Yahweh's victorious presence or intervention in holy war. In the passages deriving from the Yahwistic stratum of the Hexateuch this theme is emphasized without any clear indication of the way in which Yahweh's presence with the ark was conceived and without any clear allusion to throne or theophany symbolism (Num. 10: 35-36; 14:39-45; Jud. 3-6). One simply receives the impression of an almost undefined mana-like power inherently present with the ark which yet represents Yahweh's sovereign independence of human manipulation even though his intervention is invoked by a cultic official associated with the ark. These may tentatively be considered the oldest traceable themes associated with the ark from the presettlement period. In terms of their contextual associations in J these passages also depict the ark as the means whereby Yahweh led Israel from Sinai to Canaan. This may represent a traditional view going back at least to the early period of the settlement in Canaan since it seems to be presupposed in the internal context of Joshua 3-6 as well as in the larger context.

In the passages from I and II Samuel which reflect Shiloh traditions, the holy war symbolism of the ark is most prominent in the ark story of I Samuel 4-6, II Samuel 6. Like the passages in J, this seems to depict both a mana-like power present with the ark and, at the same time, Yahweh's sovereign independence. It likewise depicts the movements of the ark as the symbol of Yahweh's abandonment of Shiloh and his choice of Jerusalem as his cult place (cf. Pss. 78; 132). This is analogous to the representation of the ark in J as the medium of divine leading from Sinai to Canaan. Not evident in the J passages but closely associated with the ark in the Shiloh traditions are the cherubim as a theophany and throne symbol and connected with this the divine title *yhwh* *s^{e}bā’ôt*. These probably represent the assimilation of Canaanite ideas and symbols into the Yahwistic ark cult at Shiloh and as such are an important connecting link between the earlier significance of the ark as a holy war symbol and the later development of the theme of Yahweh's kingship in the Jerusalem cult tradition (I Sam. 4-6 + II Sam. 6; Pss. 24; 80; 99).

The function of the ark and cherubim as the focal point for the reception of oracles and prophetic revelations in the context of theophany-like appearances of Yahweh constitutes another line of continuity between the Shiloh and Jerusalem cult traditions (I Sam. 3; Ex. 25; Is. 6; Ezek. 1; 9-11). The interconnections of this theme with the other themes is apparent in various early psalms which allude to the ark or cherubim. These allusions occur in close contextual association with allusions to the Sinai theophany tradition which are cast partly in poetic imagery reminiscent of Canaanite storm-god mythology and at the same time in close connection with the themes of holy war deliverance by Yahweh and the conquest of Canaan (Ps. 68; Deut. 33; cf. Pss. 18; 80; 99; 104). The Sinai theophany tradition itself and its connection with Moses as the covenant mediator and recipient of oracles and prophet-like revelations must go back to the presettlement period. But the specific association of theophany-like appearances and holy war interventions of Yahweh with the cherubim as a throne symbol must reflect the assimilation of Canaanite storm-god imagery and symbolism during the premonarchic settlement period.

CHAPTER II. THE ARK AND THE CULTIC ESTABLISHMENTS OF DAVID AND SOLOMON ACCORDING TO THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL AND KINGS

Von Rad argues that under Saul and David the sacral character of Israelite warfare was destroyed by its lack of success in dealing with the Philistines and especially by David's primary dependence upon his personal army of professional mercenaries.[1] Thus wars of the traditional holy war type ceased to be fought. The holy war traditions of the past became simply memories and traditions which continued to influence theological reflection but not military and political reality. He concedes that occasional unsuccessful attempts may have been made to revive holy war as an actual method of warfare especially in Deuteronomy and under Josiah.

The old practice of depending in times of emergency simply upon a temporary volunteer army led by a charismatically inspired deliverer certainly came to an end under David. But a considerable body of evidence shows that holy war beliefs and practices did not all end suddenly with the establishment of the Davidic monarchy. Instead they were modified and assimilated into the theology of Zion and the Davidic dynasty in connection with the ark as the central symbol of the cultic establishments of David and Solomon in Jerusalem.[2]

---

[1] Heilige Krieg, pp. 33-39; cf. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, p. 263, L. E. Toombs, "War, Ideas of," IDB, IV, 798, and M. Weber, Ancient Judaism, tr. H. H. Gerth and D. Martindale (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1952 [original German, 1921]), pp. 98-101.

[2] See Smend, Jahwekrieg und Stämmebund, pp. 61-65, for a summary discussion of the evidence concerning David.

A. The Shiloh Priestly Family and David's Rise to Power

Many passages indicate that during the period of David's conflict with Saul and his rise to power he maintained the practice of obtaining oracular guidance from Yahweh in connection with war plans and other crucial decisions (I Sam. 22:10,15; 23:2,4,9-12; 30:7-8; II Sam. 2:1; 5:19, 23-24). In some cases the oracle is reported in terms of the traditional holy war formula announcing Yahweh's promise of victory (*kî-ʼᵃnî nôtēn ʼet-pᵉlištîm bᵉyādekā*, I Sam. 23:4, *kî-nātôn ʼettēn ʼet-pᵉlištîm bᵉyādekā*, II Sam. 5:19; cf. I Sam. 23:11-12; 30:8).[1] The mediating of such oracular guidance seems to have been the primary priestly function of Abiathar after he joined David (I Sam. 23:9-12; 30:7-8). Abiathar's method involving the ephod (I Sam. 23:6,9; 30:7) clearly derived from its function as an important cultic symbol at the sanctuary of Nob, where David had previously obtained help and oracular guidance from Ahimelech, the father of Abiathar (I Sam. 21:10; 22:9-15,18,20-23).

The ephod as a priestly garment probably was closely connected with the ark in the cultic practices of Shiloh, which were kept alive by the priestly family of Eli at Nob and by Abiathar in the service of David. Although not mentioned together in the same context in stories from Shiloh, the wearing of the ephod was probably associated with service before the ark at Shiloh (I Sam. 2:18,28; cf. 14:3). The account of David bringing the ark to Jerusalem reflects the custom of wearing the ephod in the presence of the ark (II Sam. 6:14). Such a relation between ephod and ark may also be implied in the references to Ahijah of the Shiloh priestly family at Nob obtaining guidance by divination for Saul in the battle against the Philistines at Michmash, though the mention of the ark is textually uncertain (I Sam. 14:3,18-19).[1] In the same story Ahijah ("the priest," vs. 36) encourages Saul to observe the rules of holy war and to depend upon divination for guidance (vss. 36-42). In the text of the LXX the urim and thummim are named as the actual objects used in casting lots for divination (vss. 41-42).[2] Saul's despair when he visits the witch at Endor is attributed to lack of oracular guidance through dreams, through urim, or through prophets (I Sam. 28:6), a situation which Hertzberg regards as the result of the annihilation of the priests at Nob (I Sam. 22:6-23).[3] The Pentateuchal Priestly traditions concerning the tabernacle, probably reflecting Shiloh traditions transmitted at Jerusalem, describe the priestly garments in a way which indicates the close connection of the ephod, the breastpiece and the urim and thummim (Ex. 28:5-30; Lev. 8:7-8; cf. Ex. 39:2-21).[1] This evidence all confirms the importance of the ark or the associated ephod with urim and thummim in obtaining divinatory guidance in holy war at the time of David's rise to power, in dependence on customs and traditions deriving from Shiloh.

---

[1] On formulae of this type as characteristic of holy war see von Rad, *Heilige Krieg*, pp. 7-9.

---

[1] In vs. 18a LXX ms. B reads *prosagage to ephoud* instead of MT *haggîšâ ’^{a}rôn hā’^{e}lôhîm*. In vs. 18b the parenthetical generalization in LXX ms. B reads *hoti autos ēren to ephoud en tēi hēmerāi ekeinēi enōpion Israēl* in contrast to MT *kî-hāyâ ’^{a}rôn hā’^{e}lôhim bayyôm hahû’ ûb^{e}nê yiśrā’ēl* (where *ûb^{e}nê* at least is certainly corrupt). The LXX readings seem preferable at first sight and are accepted by most commentators since they harmonize with the reference in vs. 3 to Ahijah carrying the ephod and since the ephod rather than the ark is mentioned in I Sam. 23:9; 30:7 with the same verb *higgîš* as the instrument of divination in battle. So S. R. Driver, *Samuel*, p. 110, Caird, "Samuel," pp. 874, 952, and *BH*. However Hertzberg, *Samuel*, pp. 113-114, has recently defended the plausibility of the MT as the more original and difficult yet not impossible reading. The LXX reading could represent a harmonization of this passage with the other passages where the ephod is mentioned as well as with the tradition of I Sam. 4-6, II Sam. 6 that the ark remained at Kiriath-Jearim throughout the time of Saul. Yet it is not impossible that Saul and the priestly family of Shiloh represented by Ahijah and the priests at Nob may have temporarily retrieved the ark from Kiriath-Jearim where it was kept perhaps mainly under the compulsion of the Philistines; cf. Hertzberg, pp. 61-62. The suggestion of Davies, "Ark of the Covenant," p. 224, that Saul's neglect of the ark was one reason for his estrangement from Samuel is nothing more than a guess.

[2] There is good reason to accept the reading of the LXX in vs. 41 since it is difficult to see why such a reading would have been inserted as a gloss. The misvocalized *tmym* of the MT reflects the difficulty caused by the omission of the words. So Driver, *Samuel*, pp. 117-118. Hertzberg, *Samuel*, p. 111, seems to reject the LXX reading but without explanation.

[3] Hertzberg, *Samuel*, p. 218.

B. The Ark and David's Holy War Victories

The stories of David's wars after he became king are not full-fledged holy war stories of the type found in traditions of the premonarchic period. Yet they illustrate the continued importance of holy war ideas and customs. Representing interpretations close to the events themselves, the two stories of battles against the Philistines in the valley of Rephaim stress David's dependence on oracular guidance and attribute his victories to the direct intervention of Yahweh (II Sam. 5:17-21,22-25).[2] The short annalistic summaries of David's foreign conquests in II Samuel 8:1-14 likewise attribute his success to Yahweh in a conventional and formula-like way (vss. 6,14).[1] The only surviving stories dealing at length with one of David's foreign wars tell of his campaigns against the Ammonites (II Sam. 10-12). These stories indicate that holy war practices were carefully observed by David's professional army. At the crucial point before the beginning of the decisive battle of the first campaign, Joab's rallying cry to the army commits the outcome to Yahweh in trust, a central and essential aspect of holy war (10:12).[2] The custom of taking the ark along on such foreign expeditions is shown in the context of the story of David's treachery against Uriah by the quite incidental reference to its presence in the third Ammonite campaign (11:11). This incidental and matter-of-fact way of referring to the ark is evidence that its presence on such a campaign was the customary practice. The same story also correlates the presence of the ark with the practice of traditional holy war sacral disciplines such as sexual abstinence and dietary rules which are just as binding upon David's professional army under Joab as upon the volunteer army of Israel and Judah (11:6-13).[3] The fact that Joab postpones the final victory over Rabbah until David comes to lead the siege himself (12:26-31) probably means that Joab regards David as Yahweh's designated instrument of victory. This viewpoint is also evident in the brief story of the conquest of Jerusalem (II Sam. 5:6-10 = I Chr. 11:4-9) where the concluding summary attributes David's growing power entirely to the fact that *yhwh* *’^{e}lôhê* *ṣ^{e}bā’ôt* *^{c}immô* even though the Chronicles account shows clearly that Joab was the real hero.

---

[1] For balanced discussions of the complicated problem of the ephod and the urim and thummim see de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 349-353, and G. H. Davies, "Ephod (Object)," *IDB*, II, 118-119. Since the evidence concerning the precise nature of the ephod and its relation to the ark and other cult objects is meager and seemingly inconsistent in some respects, it has been the subject of a number of rather speculative studies which cannot be followed with confidence, for example Arnold, *Ephod and Ark*, and J. Morgenstern, *The Ark, the Ephod, and the "Tent of Meeting"* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1945).

[2] Traditional literary criticism attributes these stories to the so-called "Early Source," Caird, "Samuel," p. 859. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, pp. 62-63, and *History*, pp. 178-179, 186-188, groups them with the complex of stories about the rise of David (I Sam. 16:14-II Sam. 5:25 in the main) which he regards as a connected narrative by an author with highly reliable knowledge of the events.

---

[1] The compilation of these summaries is commonly attributed to the deuteronomic editor; cf. Caird, "Samuel," p. 862, and Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, p. 65. However, it seems more plausible to regard them as originally a continuation of the stories of the battles against the Philistines in 5:17-25 and as direct extracts from David's royal annals; cf. Hertzberg, Samuel, pp. 272-273, 289-290, and authors cited by him.

[2] Cf. von Rad, Heilige Krieg, pp. 9-10, 31.

[3] Cf. Weber, Ancient Judaism, p. 91, Pedersen, Israel, III-IV, 10, 232, von Rad, Heilige Krieg, pp. 7, 28, 35-37, and de Vaux, Ancient Israel, p. 263.

The military rôle of the ark during David's reign is further evident in the story of the flight of David and his government from Jerusalem during the revolt of Absalom (II Sam. 15:13-37). The priests Abiathar and Zadok take for granted that the ark is to be taken along. Only by the special command of David do they return with it to Jerusalem. By this symbolic act of trust David commits his fate to Yahweh (vss. 24-26). The command to return the ark is, however, also a part of David's plan to plant Zadok and Abiathar and then Hushai in Jerusalem as agents who will aid secretly in the overthrow of Absalom (vss. 27-29, 32-37). David's prayer that Yahweh will defeat the counsel of Ahithophel, Absalom's chief advisor, implies that David regards the return of the ark to Jerusalem as the symbol of Yahweh's hoped-for intervention against Absalom and his supporters (vs. 31). Abiathar of the priestly family of Eli at Shiloh and Nob continues throughout David's reign as one of his two highest priestly officials and functions as one of the two chief attendants of the ark, further confirming the continuing centrality of the holy war and other traditions formerly associated with the ark at Shiloh (II Sam. 8:17; 15:24-29,35-36; 17:15; 19:12; 20:25; I Kgs. 2:26; cf. 4:4).[1]

---

[1] It is not necessary at this point to discuss the difficult question of the origin and background of Zadok who is always represented after David's establishment in Jerusalem as sharing the highest priestly office under David with Abiathar. The MT of II Sam. 15:24-29 seems to

C. The Establishment of the Ark Cult at Zion by David

These scattered items of information concerning the continued significance of the idea of holy war under David and the function of the ark in connection with it throw light on the meaning of the story of David bringing the ark to Jerusalem in II Samuel 6. The first part of the story in I Samuel 4-6 depicts the ark above all as the instrument of Yahweh's victory over Israel's enemies and the symbol of his sovereignty and power. Although the story speaks only of victories wrought directly by Yahweh through the ark, the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem must have been closely correlated with David's victories over the Philistines as well as with his conquest of Jerusalem.[1] Therefore David's act of bringing the ark to Jerusalem celebrated Yahweh's deliverance of Israel from the Philistines and symbolized the full restoration of his victorious

---

represent Zadok as the one who has primary charge of the ark. But the text is somewhat confused and may originally have mentioned Abiathar along with Zadok in vss. 24,27; cf. Driver, *Samuel*, pp. 315-316, and Hertzberg, *Samuel*, pp. 339, 343. In the other passages the two priests seem to be ranked as completely coordinate with one another so that there is no way to distinguish their respective roles. In I Kgs. 2:26 Abiathar's role in carrying the ark *lipnê dāwid* is stressed as the reason for his reprieve from death after supporting Adonijah's attempt to seize the throne. There is no textual basis and no other convincing reason for emending *'ārôn* to *'ēpôd* in this passage as is sometimes suggested, as for example by J. Gray, *Kings*, p. 106.

[1] On this correlation see Pedersen, *Israel*, III-IV, 230-231, and A. Bentzen, "The Cultic Use of the Story of the Ark in Samuel," *JBL*, LXVII (1948), 52. The conquest of Jerusalem and especially the bringing of the ark must have presupposed at least some successes against the Philistines. So Noth, *History*, pp. 187-190. Hertzberg, *Samuel*, pp. 275, 296, thinks the conquest of Jerusalem occurred between the two victories over the Philistines recorded in II Sam. 5:17-25. On the other hand Caird, "Samuel," pp. 1069, 1071, 1074, argues that the major victories over the Philistines followed the conquest of Jerusalem. Even on this assumption it is likely that the bringing of the ark was closely correlated with plans to overthrow the Philistines.

presence and power to Israel which had become evident through the victories of David.[1] The war cries and trumpet blowing which accompany the bringing of the ark confirm the holy war symbolism of the ceremony (II Sam. 6:15; cf. I Sam. 4:5-8; Josh. 6:4-20).[2]

Although II Samuel 6 shows that David initiated the decision to bring the ark to Jerusalem, it also stresses the belief that Yahweh himself consented to come to Jerusalem and to bless David with his presence.[3] This is apparent from the omens associated with the ark which guided and controlled David. The death of Uzzah forced him to abandon the project temporarily (vss. 6-10). But the blessings which come to the house of Obed-edom then encouraged him to complete it (vss. 11-12). This confirms the view that David's establishment of the ark cult at Jerusalem was the original and most fundamental basis for the idea of Yahweh's election of Zion, which was in turn inseparable from the idea of his election of David, as evident especially in Psalm 132.[4] There is no hint in the story that the ark was installed in a previously existing holy place, that its cult was combined in any way with a previously existing Jerusalem cult, or even that it displaced a previously existing cult. Instead it was installed in a tent sanctuary prepared especially for it in the City of David (vss. 12,17). The whole story indicates that David was simply re-establishing the Shiloh ark cult and sanctuary at a new place which had had no previous sacral significance at all for Israel.[1] The holiness of Zion as a Yahwistic cult place derived first of all from this act and from the ark itself rather than from any pre-existing Jebusite cult place or tradition. The assimilation of Jebusite traditions must be regarded as a later stage in the development, even if this began to take place already during the reign of David.[2]

---

[1] Weber, Ancient Judaism, p. 98.

[2] Cf. Pedersen, Israel, III-IV, 19-20.

[3] Cf. Fretheim, Ark, pp. 112-120.

[4] This view is stressed especially by Kraus, Königsherrschaft Gottes, pp. 50-63, Worship, pp. 181-183, Psalmen, II, 880-882, and Schreiner, Sion-Jerusalem, pp. 40-46; cf. Noth, "Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition," pp. 174-176, 184-185, and Fretheim, Ark, pp. 121-127, 250-261.

D. The Transferral of the Zion Ark Cult to the Solomonic Temple

The account in I Kings 8:1-13,62-66 of Solomon installing the ark cult in the temple must be viewed in close connection with the story of

---

[1] Pedersen, *Israel*, III-IV, 237-240, argues that David's sanctuary for the ark must have been placed in a previous Jebusite sanctuary which he identifies with Araunah's threshing floor. But there is no evidence for this identification. De Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, p. 102, argues on the basis of the account of the anointing of Solomon in I Kgs. 1:38-39 that it was located near the Gihon spring. This is a plausible interpretation if one assumes that the reference is actually to the upper opening of the shaft and tunnel system by means of which water from the Gihon was brought inside the city wall. Otherwise de Vaux would have to assume that David's tent sanctuary was located outside the walled area of the southeast hill. But this would contradict several clear statements locating the ark and tent sanctuary inside *^{c}îr dāwid* = *m^{e}ṣûdat ṣiyyôn* (II Sam. 6:10,12,16-17; I Kgs. 8:1); cf. below, chap. 3, §B. If one were to accept de Vaux's suggestion with this qualification this might enhance the argument that David's tent sanctuary was located on or near an earlier Jebusite cult place. But even if this rather tenuous series of conjectures is granted, the evidence still stands that the basic cultic continuity of David's tent sanctuary and ark cult was with Shiloh rather than with any local Jebusite cult.

[2] This contrasts with the views of Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 48-49, who cites E. Rohland, *Die Bedeutung der Erwählungstraditionen Israels für die Eschatologie der altestamentlichen Propheten* (Heidelberg dissertation, 1956), pp. 119ff.; cf. von Rad, *Theology*, I, 46-47. They regard the idea of Yahweh's election of Zion as deriving primarily from Jebusite El Elyon mythology. But this overlooks the fundamental significance of the bringing of the ark as the symbol of Yahweh choosing to dwell in Zion and substitutes a hypothesis based mainly on rather distant non-Israelite comparative materials.

David bringing the ark to Jerusalem.[1] Just as I Samuel 4-6, II Samuel 6 functions as a *hieros logos* linking the Davidic ark sanctuary and cult with the sanctuary at Shiloh, so I Kings 8 links the Solomonic temple as the new ark sanctuary with the Davidic tent sanctuary.[2] Thus, cultically speaking, the temple was in complete continuity with David's tent and its Shiloh antecedent.[3] In cultic significance, though perhaps not in literary transmission, this story must have served as a supplement to the story in II Samuel 6 in order to show how the ark came to its final and permanent resting place in the temple. In both cases the ceremony of "bringing up" (*l^{e}ha^{ca}lôt*, II Sam. 6:2; I Kgs. 8:1) the ark is represented as a great festival occasion at which the king presides. In I Kings 8:2 the occasion is specifically identified with the autumn festival. The primary cultic purpose in each case was the installation of the ark in its appointed place in the newly constructed sanctuary.[1]

---

[1] Following most commentators Solomon's speech, prayer and blessing (vss. 14-61) will be regarded as Deuteronomic and post-Deuteronomic supplements which may be left out of consideration in this discussion. Cf. Montgomery, *Kings*, pp. 193-195, N. H. Snaith, "The First and Second Books of Kings: Introduction and Exegesis," *IB*, III (1954), 68, 73-88, and Gray, *Kings*, pp. 189, 197-215. There are complicated textual and literary critical problems in this passage. In general the original nucleus may be reconstructed by following the shorter text of the LXX in vss. 1-5 and omitting words which Gray, pp. 189-195, regards as secondary glosses and expansions. Montgomery, p. 186, reduces the original nucleus more drastically to a small portion of vss. 1-6. But his rejection of vss. 7-12 in their entirety as secondary is unnecessary. Verses 7-9 look like a series of parenthetical explanatory remarks which are all somewhat secondary to the basic narrative which moves directly from vs. 6 to vss. 10-11. The similarity of vss. 10-11 to the Priestly tabernacle tradition of Ex. 40:34-35 need not prove the lateness of these verses as claimed by Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, p. 70, note 5, but may instead reveal the influence of the Solomonic temple tradition on P. It is clear that vss. 10-11 serve to introduce and explain the climactic poetic quotation in vss. 12-13, the antiquity of which in this context no one doubts.

[2] Gray, *Kings*, p. 194, defends the authenticity of the reference to the bringing of the *ʾōhel mô^{c}ēd* (= David's tent) and the sacred vessels to the temple along with the ark.

[3] Cf. Pedersen, *Israel*, III-IV, 244-245.

The story in I Kings 8:10-11 differs from II Samuel 6 however in that the act of installing the ark paves the way for the climactic manifestation of the *k^{e}bôd yhwh* in the temple in the form of a cloud theophany.[2] Thus the ark-and-cherubim throne symbolism and the accompanying theophanic self-manifestation of Yahweh together constituted the central cultic symbols of his presence in the temple. This close connection of the ark and cherubim with cloud theophany symbolism has already been discussed as one of the important elements of continuity between the Shiloh cult and the Jerusalem temple cult. However, certain other important associations are not evident here such as Canaanite storm-god imagery, allusions to holy war themes, and the title *yhwh ṣ^{e}bā'ôt*. Instead, the story focuses in a single-minded way upon Yahweh's presence in the temple symbolized by the installation of the ark beneath the wings of the cherubim. The theme of Yahweh's theophany visitation, closely resembling the Priestly tabernacle tradition (especially Ex. 40:34-35; cf. 25:8; 29:43-46), is used here to emphasize Yahweh's abiding presence in the temple. One may assume that these crucial "founding events" were re-enacted cultically in connection with the autumn festival as recurring celebrations of Yahweh's presence and his election of Zion, as implied in Psalms 132 and 24:7-10.[1]

---

[1] Note the similar wording, *wayyābî'û 'et-'^{a}rôn yhwh wayyaṣṣîgû 'ôtô bimqômô b^{e}tôk hā'ōhel '^{a}šer nāṭâ-lô dāwid*, in II Sam. 6:17, and *wayyābî'û hakkôh^{a}nîm 'et-hā'ārôn 'el-m^{e}qômô 'el-d^{e}bîr habbayit* ... *'el-taḥat p^{e}nê hakk^{e}rûbîm*, in I Kgs. 8:6, emending to *hā'ārôn* with the LXX.

[2] Note the parallel expressions *w^{e}he^{c}ānān mālē' 'et-bêt yhwh*, vs. 10b, and *kî-mālē' k^{e}bôd-yhwh 'et-bêt yhwh*, vs. 11b, which serve to explain each other without differentiating them from each other. On the antiquity of this passage and on identity of the cloud and the *kābôd* here in contrast to the distinction between them in P see Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 149-150.

The emphasis on Yahweh's abiding presence in the temple is especially clear in the ancient dedicatory poem in I Kings 8:12-13 attributed to Solomon and quoted at this point to sum up the significance of the entire story.

12 *yhwh haššemeš hēkîn* (or *hôpîa^{c}*) *baššāmayim* / *wayyô’mer liškōn*
bā^{ca}rāpel

13 *bānôh bānîtî bêt z^{e}bul lāk* / *mākôn l^{e}šibt^{e}kā ^{c}ôlāmîm*[2]

The focal point of the poem, found in the words *wayyô’mer liškōn bā^{ca}rāpel*, perhaps allude to a cultic oracle spoken in connection with the ark announcing Yahweh's decision to establish his dwelling place in the darkness of the cloud in the *d^{e}bir* of the Solomonic temple.[3] The primary reference of the archaic verb škn in the Old Testament is to impermanent or semipermanent nomadic encamping or dwelling in a tent.[1] When used in P, however, to refer to Yahweh's "dwelling" in connection with the tabernacle, contextual associations often give it clear overtones of a cloud theophany visitation or presence.[2] This is not just a late idea or development in connection with the verb škn, as appears from its use in a similar theophany setting in Psalm 68:17-19 (cf. Deut. 33:16). The word ᶜarāpel in I Kings 8:12 is even more clearly a theophany term, similar in meaning to ᶜānān in verses 10-11. It is used in a number of theophany contexts to refer to the darkness or dark cloud which veils or accompanies Yahweh's theophany manifestations (Ex. 20:21; Deut. 4:11,22; Pss. 18:10; 97:2; cf. Job 22:13).[3] The reference to the sun which Yahweh has placed or caused to shine in the sky sets the theophany symbolism of the ark and cherubim in the temple in clear contrast to any kind of solar cult (I Kgs. 8:12 LXX).[4] The basic line of cultic continuity lies instead with the traditions associated with the ark deriving from Shiloh.

---

[1] Kraus, *Königsherrschaft Gottes*, pp. 27-65, *Worship*, pp. 181-186, 208-215, and Fretheim, *Ark*, pp. 105-108, 260-274.

[2] The mutilated Hebrew text of this poetic statement must be reconstructed on the basis of the LXX. While certain details of this reconstruction may be debated, there is a fairly wide consensus that the words preserved in the MT should be retained with little or no change except that the missing first half of the first line should be restored on the basis of the LXX. For our purposes the restoration by Gray, *Kings*, p. 196, is satisfactory and has been followed above. Similar restorations are accepted by Montgomery, *Kings*, p. 190, *BH*, and RSV. The antiquity and possible Solomonic origin of the poem is widely acknowledged by recent commentators such as Gray, p. 197, J. Mauchline, "I and II Kings," *PCB*, §294L, and Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 152. Cf. the varying opinions cited by Montgomery, p. 191. This is supported by the fact that the LXX attributes the poem to the "Book of Song," *ouk idou hautē gegraptai en bibliōi tēs ōidēs* (vs. 53 LXX). The Hebrew antecedent of this, *h^{a}lô’-hû’ k^{e}tûbâ ^{c}al-sēper haššîr*, may reflect an original reading, *sēper hayyāšār*, the title of the ancient collection of poetry mentioned in Josh. 10:13 and II Sam. 1:18. Cf. C. F. Kraft, "Jashar, Book of," *IDB*, II, 803.

[3] On Yahweh's concealment in the darkness of the storm cloud see II Sam. 22:10,12 = Ps. 18:10,12; Ps. 97:2.

---

[1] Cross, "The Priestly Tabernacle," pp. 225-226.

[2] This is especially the case in Ex. 40:35; Num. 9:17-18,22; 10:12. Cf. the use of the same expression for the Sinai theophany in Ex. 24:16. Other passages referring to Yahweh dwelling in the tabernacle sanctuary probably refer to the theophany self-manifestation of Yahweh between the cherubim above the ark in which oracles are communicated to Moses, Ex. 25:8,22; 29:42,46. Cf. chap. 1, §E.

[3] A similar view is expressed by Snaith, "Kings," p. 71. A modification of this symbolism may occur in later prophetic portrayals of the coming day of Yahweh in terms of ominous clouds and darkness as manifestations of impending terror and doom, Zeph. 1:15; Joel 2:2; cf. Ezek. 34:12.

[4] This passage pointedly makes the sun a creature and instrument of Yahweh and contrasts it with the mysterious hiddenness of Yahweh's theophany presence in the darkness of the dᵉbîr. This rules out various speculative attempts based on this passage to discover, sometimes by means of conjectural emendations, a sun cult as the original form of the Solomonic temple cult, as for example by F. J. Hollis, "The Sun-cult and

The second line of Solomon's poetic statement, I Kings 8:13, shows that the theophany symbolism of the ark and cherubim has been assimilated more explicitly to the imagery of a king enthroned in his royal palace.[1] The emphatic word *^{c}ôlāmîm* must imply a contrast to the various movements of the ark between the time of its removal from Shiloh and its installation in the temple. Perhaps it also implies a final and permanent settling down as the climax or goal of its journeyings with Israel from Sinai. The ark was installed in the temple with the intention and faith that it remain forever as the symbol of Yahweh's presence. Probably the ark was no longer carried into battle or removed from the temple for any purpose other than the cultic processionals. The old holy war associations were not forgotten, however, but instead had to be adapted to the new cultic arrangements.

E. The Ark and Nathan's Dynastic Oracle

The only other significant allusion to the ark in Samuel-Kings occurs in the account of Nathan's oracle in II Samuel 7. The dating and

---

the Temple at Jerusalem," *Myth and Ritual: The Myth and Ritual Patterns of the Ancient East*, ed. S. H. Hooke (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), pp. 87-110, and H. G. May, "Some Aspects of Solar Worship at Jerusalem," *ZAW*, LV (1937), 269-281. See the brief but effective criticism of such views in Montgomery, *Kings*, pp. 141-142, 190-191.

[1] On the translation of this line see Gray, *Kings*, pp. 196-197. The meaning "prince" for the word *zbl* in the Ugaritic texts makes it plausible that the debated word *z^{e}bul* here means "exalted dwelling" with the particular connotation "royal palace." A similar meaning would fit Isaiah 63:15, where the reference is to Yahweh's heavenly dwelling place. In the context of allusions to the ark-and-cherubim theophany symbolism the term *l^{e}šibt^{e}kā* must certainly mean "for you to sit enthroned." Cf. also W. F. Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, ed. H. H. Rowley (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950), p. 16, who translates *mākôn* *l^{e}šibt^{e}kā* *^{c}ôlāmîm* as "A dais for Thy eternal seat."

literary analysis of this passage have been so much disputed that one hesitates to use it as a source in tracing any kind of historical development. Nevertheless, it is so important that it cannot be bypassed. Form-critical similarities between it and the so-called Egyptian *Königsnovelle* have led an increasing number of scholars in recent years to consider the entire chapter as a literary unity, aside from a few possible Deuteronomic glosses, and to trace its origin, at least in its essential form and content, to the royal court of David.[1] This view may be accepted as the most plausible working hypothesis.

One of the significant and yet perplexing aspects of II Samuel 7 is the way in which it brings the question of building a temple for the ark together with the dynastic promise to David. The chief formal connecting link binding the various parts of the chapter together is the ark as the focal point for Nathan's reception of the oracle and for David's prayer in response. The chief element of content tying the chapter together is the play on the word *bayit*. David's initial approach to Nathan seems to be a request for an oracle authorizing the construction of a temple for the ark (vss. 1-3).[1] The story clearly indicates that Nathan's oracle was an incubation oracle which, in this context, we must assume was received in the presence of the ark (vs. 4). Likewise David's prayer was offered in the presence of the ark (*lipnê yhwh*, vs. 18a). In this passage and in the other two stories in which Nathan plays a role he functions as a court prophet whom David himself treats as an authoritative spokesman for Yahweh and who actively influences the destiny of the dynasty (II Sam. 12; I Kgs. 1). Although his background is unknown, Nathan's authoritative role may perhaps be explained by the hypothesis that he held a traditional charismatic prophetic office closely associated with the ark and analogous to that of Samuel in I Samuel 3.[2]

---

[1] This tendency has been prompted especially by an article of S. Herrmann, "Die Königsnovelle in Ägypten und in Israel: Ein Beitrag zur Gattungsgeschichte in den Geschichtsbüchern des Alten Testaments," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig, Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*, 3. Jahrgang (1953-1954), Heft I, pp. 51-62, whose arguments are followed for example by Noth, "David und Israel in 2. Samuel 7," pp. 342-345, Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 56-57, and in part at least by Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 75-76. An earlier analysis which gained wide acceptance was that of Rost, *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids*, pp. 47ff., who regarded vss. 1-7,11b,16,18-21,25-29 as the earliest literary stratum with vss. 11b,16 as the oldest nucleus going back to the time of David. In sharp contrast to these views is Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, pp. 370-373, who argues vehemently and at length that the passage is a late fourth century midrash based on Ps. 89:2-5. But Caird, "Samuel," pp. 864-865, 1082, 1084, who accepts Pfeiffer's arguments in the main, shows that Ps. 89:2-5 must presuppose an older pre-exilic poetic prophecy of which he finds fragments in II Sam. 7:8b-9a,10,12,14-16, an analysis that conflicts notably with that of Rost.

Stylistically the oracle and the prayer both seem wordy, overfull and sometimes repetitious. This has given rise to various attempts at literary analysis. Possibly the oracle was originally composed in poetic form and subsequently rewritten in prose. But its original poetic form can hardly be reconstructed.[3] A more fruitful method of approach is to look for the "embryonic oracle" which may have constituted the nucleus of the prophetic message or "word" received by Nathan and which he himself and perhaps others then expanded and interpreted, probably in several stages.[1] The oracle is reported as a private oracle to Nathan containing the oracle he is instructed to deliver to David (vss. 4-5). The embryonic oracle to David must be preserved in the ejaculatory question ha'attâ tibneh-lî bayit l^{e}šibtî (vs. 5b). Verses 6-7 introduced by kî must represent Nathan's own explanatory expansion of these words. This embryonic oracle has no hint, however, of the dynastic oracle to David. But in David's prayer an equally brief oracle is quoted which forms a perfectly balanced antithesis, bayit 'ebneh lāk (vs. 27a). These two balancing statements with their enigmatic play on the expression bānâ bayit may have constituted the original nucleus of Nathan's oracle. This is confirmed by the occurrence of a variant of the words of verse 27a in verse 11b where it is marked out from the context both by an introductory formula and by a sudden shift from first person to third person style, w^{e}higgîd l^{e}kā yhwh kî-bayit ya^{ca}śeh-l^{e}kā yhwh. Indeed, yibneh rather than ya^{ca}śeh should perhaps be read.[2] The remainder of the dynastic portion of the oracle in verses 8-16 may represent an accumulation of explanatory expansions and interpretations of the second half of the original embryonic oracle or else a compilation of other similar dynastic oracles. Notable is the occurrence of several varying but in effect synonymous statements using the verb *kwn*. In contexts referring to David's dynastic successor we find *wah^{a}kînotî* *'et-mamlaktô* (vs. 12b) and~~,~~ more elaborately, *w^{e}kônantî* *'et-kissē'* *mamlaktô* *^{c}ad-^{c}ôlām* (vs. 13b). Still more elaborate is what appears to be a poetic line with synonymous parallelism, *w^{e}ne'man* *bêt^{e}kā* *ûmamlaktô* ... *l^{e}pāneykā* / *kis'^{a}kā* *yihyeh* *nākôn* *^{c}ad-^{c}ôlām* (vs. 16).[1] Still another variant occurs in David's prayer, *ûbêt* *^{c}abd^{e}kā* *dāwid* *yihyeh* *nākôn* *l^{e}pāneykā* (vs. 26b), where it is based explicitly upon a citation of the original embryonic oracle, *bêt* *'ebnehlāk* (vs. 27a). All these may reflect either interpretative clarifications of this enigmatic embryonic oracle or they may be supplementary or~~acles~~ making the dynastic implications more explicit. At least some of these may derive from Nathan himself.[2] Verses 12-16, introduced by an explanatory *kî*, as well as verses 8-11a also interpret the primary oracle in still other and more explicit ways.

---

[1] Cf. J. Lindblom, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1962), p. 77.

[2] See the discussion of I Sam. 3 above, chap. I, §C, and Kraus, *Worship*, pp. 105-112. The hypothesis of G. W. Ahlström, "Der Prophet Nathan und der Tempelbau," *VT*, XI (1961), 124-127, that Nathan represented a Jebusite cultic faction along with Zadok has little supporting evidence, cf. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 88.

[3] For two contrasting attempts to detect poetic elements in the dynastic portion of the oracle see H. P. Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899), pp. 299-301, and Caird, "Samuel," p. 865.

---

[1] This method of analysis has been fruitfully applied to the oracles of Isaiah by R. B. Y. Scott, "The Literary Structure of Isaiah's Oracles," Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, pp. 185-186, and "The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 1-39: Introduction and Exegesis," IB, V (1956), 155. It is not intended to rule out the possibility of later literary glosses.

[2] The text of this half verse has been preserved in several different forms. The LXX reading contradicts the context so flatly that it must be rejected except that oikodomēseis may reflect a Hebrew text with the verb bnh instead of ^{c}śh as in vs. 27a. The parallel in MT of I Chr. 17:10b may therefore be correct in reading yibneh instead of ya^{ca}śeh, though it is otherwise in disorder apparently through a tendency to smooth out the text by maintaining the first person style.

Both the original embryonic oracle and the interpretative expansions stress Yahweh's freedom and sovereignty in dealing with David and set this in contrast to David's dependence on Yahweh.[3] In one interpretative expansion Yahweh's freedom is symbolized, as in the ark narrative of I Samuel 4-6, II Samuel 6, by the freedom with which the ark has been accustomed to move about, a freedom which must not be compromised by the construction of a permanent temple (vss. 6-7). Yet Yahweh, whose sovereign power is symbolized by the ark, responds to David's request in an apparently unexpected way in the oracle given through Nathan. David and his "house" rather than a temple for the ark are designated as the permanent symbol and instrument of Yahweh's rule and protection over Israel. David's rise to power and his holy war victories, which have given security to Israel, are summarized as divine acts constituting a precedent and basis for the dynastic promise (vss. 8-11a). The emphatic use of the title *yhwh ṣ^{e}bāʾôt* further confirms this linking of the dynastic promise to the ark as a holy war symbol (vss. 8,26-27). The part of the oracle forbidding the building of a temple was of course violated by Solomon. This would hardly have been done without oracular guidance or approval. Verse 13a perhaps reflects such a supplementary oracle given later on by Nathan himself or by some other cultic prophet to confirm Solomon's plans.[1]

---

[1] Reading *lipnê* with most commentators on the basis of several Hebrew mss. and the *LXX*; cf. *BH*. The first *^{c}ad-^{c}ôlām* may perhaps be dropped as a prosaic but superfluous addition made for the sake of emphasis (cf. vs. 26b). This yields a rhythmic 4:4 poetic line. I Chr. 17:14 has the first half line in still a different but less original form.

[2] On the possible tension between factions loyal to the Shiloh tent sanctuary traditions and factions advocating the building of a permanent temple see Fretheim, *Ark*, pp. 79-84, 93-104.

[3] Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 58-59.

One element in the symbolism of Solomon's temple probably reveals a close link between Nathan's dynastic oracle and the ark as the symbol of Yahweh's powerful presence. According to a hypothesis advanced by R. B. Y. Scott, the free-standing pillars "Jachin" and "Boaz" in front of the temple probably had dynastic oracles inscribed upon them (I Kgs. 7:15-22).[2] He argues that the name *yākîn* of the south pillar is the initial word of an inscription which he reconstructs as *ykyn* (*yhwh*) *ks' dwd ᶜd ᶜwlm*.[1] He draws his evidence from passages using the verb *kwn* to refer to divine confirmation of kingship or of the Davidic dynasty, especially the passages from Nathan's oracle in II Samuel 7 discussed above.[2] The name *bōᶜaz* for the south pillar he regards as a misvocalization of *bᵉᶜōz*, the initial word of an inscription he reconstructs as *bᶜz yhwh yśmḥ mlk* on the basis of Psalm 21:2a and other psalm passages which use the word *ᶜōz* to refer to Yahweh's victorious strength.[3] Although one must regard the reconstruction of the oracle on the "Boaz" pillar as considerably less certain than that on the "Jachin" pillar, the inscription hypothesis itself and the opening word of each one seem convincing. Attention has already been called to the probable use of the term *ᶜōz* in Psalm 132:8 = II Chronicles 6:41 and Psalm 78:61 to refer specifically to the mysterious power of Yahweh associated with the ark in holy war as reflected in such passages as Numbers 10:35-36; Joshua 3-6; and I Samuel 4-6,

---

[1] The expression *lišmî* is sometimes taken as evidence that this vs. is a Deuteronomic gloss. However the reading *lî* in I Chr. 17:12 may be regarded as original; cf. the LXX of II Sam. 7:13 which conflates both readings.

[2] See his articles, "The Pillars Jachin and Boaz," *JBL*, LVIII (1939), 143-149, and "Jachin and Boaz," *IDB*, II, 780-781. Scott's hypothesis has

---

been received favorably for example by Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, p. 139, Snaith, "Kings," pp. 62-63, Mauchline, "I and II Kings," §294h, and Ringgren, *Israelite Religion*, p. 160.

[1] "Jachin and Boaz," p. 781. In his earlier article, "The Pillars Jachin and Boaz," p. 148, he suggested a longer reconstruction, *ykyn* (*yhwh*) *ks' dwd wmmlktw lzrᶜw ᶜd ᶜwlm*.

[2] The other passages he cites are I Sam. 13:13; 20:31 (Saul); II Sam. 5:12 (David); I Kgs. 2:12,24,45,46 (Solomon); II Chr. 17:5 (Jehoshaphat); Is. 9:6; 16:5; Ps. 89:5,22,38 (the Davidic king or dynasty). The same verb is also used with reference to Yahweh's throne in Pss. 9:8; 93:2; 103:19.

[3] He finds evidence for the revocalization of *bᶜz* in I Kgs. 7:21 in the renderings *boos* of LXX ms. A, *booz* of the Vulg., and *ischus* of II Chr. 3:17 LXX. Other occurrences of *ᶜōz* referring to Yahweh are Pss. 21:14; 74:13; 93:1; 96:6,7; 99:4; 132:8; cf. 89:14. He mentions Ps. 74:13 especially as another possible basis for reconstructing the "Boaz" oracle in terms of a more mythological content.

II Samuel 6.[1] It is therefore quite plausible to see in the "Boaz" inscription an allusion to the ark or to the power of Yahweh symbolized and embodied cultically in the ark.[2] This supports the hypothesis that during the period of the united monarchy the holy war power of Yahweh associated with the ark came to be connected closely with both the Davidic dynasty and with the Solomonic temple.[3] This connection must be considered the most important root or nucleus of the Zion and David theologies expressed in the Psalms and Isaiah.

F. The Sacred Legend of the Temple Site

One other story in Samuel must be discussed briefly although it contains no allusion to the ark. This is the story in II Samuel 24 of David's census, the plague, the appearance of the angel, and the building of an altar on the threshing floor of Araunah, which is commonly regarded as the *hieros logos* of the temple site. In terms of literary criticism the story stands isolated except for a possible connection with and resemblance to II Samuel 21:1-14.[4] This relation is primarily external rather than internal, however. Internally II Samuel 24 most closely resembles certain premonarchic sanctuary legends of probable Canaanite origin in which an angel or similar theophanic encounter plays an important part.[1] Though the evidence is tenuous this has led to suggestions that a Jebusite sanctuary legend concerning this site, but referring originally to El Elyon, has been woven into the story.[2] Such an assumption is a plausible way to explain some of the *non sequiturs* of form and content in the story. Nevertheless, the supposedly Jebusite sanctuary legend has been integrated so fully into the story of David's census and the Canaanite elements so largely submerged under Yahwistic presuppositions that the original legend can no longer be clearly isolated or reconstructed. Even the divine title *ᶜelyōn* never appears in the story. Since the plague seems to be an essential element in both the census story and the appearance of the angel, this might have been the element in the two stories which facilitated their combination. As the story stands, however, it portrays the retribution David experienced for conducting a military census and thereby expressing lack of confidence in Yahweh's defense of Israel according to the traditions of holy war.[3] The sequel then portrays Yahweh's gracious deliverance of Jerusalem from the plague that resulted from David's folly. The building of the altar is portrayed ambiguously as an act of contrition and appeal for deliverance and as an act of thanksgiving for the deliverance.[1] Thus, as *hieros logos*, the story connects the altar built by David with Yahweh's protection of Jerusalem even in the face of David's act of distrust. This, rather than any previous cultic association, gives the place its sacred character so far as this story is concerned. The altar, which is the etiological focus of the story, stands as the continuing symbol of Yahweh's gracious protection harmonizing with the symbolism of the ark, though there is nothing to indicate a direct connection.

---

[1] See chap. 1, §D.

[2] One could for example base another plausible reconstruction of the "Boaz" oracle on Ps. 21:14a, *rûmâ yhwh b^{ec}uzz^{e}kā*, which resembles the ark chant in Ps. 132:8, *qûmâ yhwh limnûḥātekā 'attâ wa'^{e}rôn ^{c}uzzekā*, or even upon Ps. 66:3b, *b^{e}rōb ^{c}uzz^{e}kā y^{e}kaḥ^{a}šû l^{e}kā 'ôy^{e}beykā*, which has clear overtones of holy war.

[3] Scott's reconstruction of the "Boaz" oracle on the basis of Ps. 21:2a stresses the association with the Davidic king. One could also base a reconstruction on Mic. 5:3a, *w^{ec}āmad w^{e}rā^{c}â b^{ec}ōz yhwh*, which refers to the Davidic king in the context of a dynastic oracle.

[4] Cf. Hertzberg, *Samuel*, pp. 410, 415-416, and Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 57.

---

[1] For example Bethel (Gen. 28:11-22), Peniel (32:24-32), Beer-lahai-roi (16:7-14), Ophrah (Jud. 6:11-24), and perhaps Moriah (Gen. 22:1-14). Cf. Weiser, *The Old Testament*, p. 60, Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, pp. 43-44, A. Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (2 vols.; 2d ed., Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1952), I, 236.

[2] This view was advanced by H. Schmidt, *Der heilige Fels in Jerusalem* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1933), pp. 78-83, who found an older strand of material in vss. 15a LXX, 10,11a,16b-17,18b,19b,21c,23b,25b, and is accepted by Schmid, "Kulttraditionen," p. 175. A similar view is presented by W. Fuss, "II Samuel 24," *ZAW*, LXXIV (1962), 145-164, and accepted by Clements, *God and Temple*, p. 61, who however finds no decisive evidence that the god is El Elyon. A more convincing literary analysis of vss. 16-25 is presented by Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 62-65, who regards vss. 16,18-21b,22-23a,25a as the older version of the story and the remainder as fragments of a later version.

[3] Von Rad, *Heilige Krieg*, pp. 37-38, and *Theology*, I, 59, 317-318.

G. Summary

This chapter has attempted to show that traditional ideas of holy war associated with the ark at Shiloh were of central importance in the political, military and religious establishments of David and Solomon at Jerusalem.[2] David depended on a member of the Shiloh priestly family for oracular guidance during his rise to power. After David's establishment at Jerusalem the ark was taken along with David's professional army under Joab in at least one of his foreign campaigns. By implication the ark seems to have been the symbol of Yahweh's intervention against Absalom's revolt. David's decisive cultic act of bringing the ark to Jerusalem symbolized and celebrated Yahweh's deliverance of Israel from the Philistines through David's victories. It likewise symbolized Yahweh's choice of Zion as his new cult place in continuity with Shiloh. The storm cloud theophany symbolism of the cherubim with its traditional holy war connotations was intimately associated with the ark in Solomon's temple. As the symbol of permanent divine presence and power the ark and cherubim became explicitly a throne symbol through the assimilation of Canaanite pictures of the high god as king. As the symbol of divine power and the symbolic source of Nathan's prophetic oracles, the ark mediated the divine choice of the Davidic dynasty as the instrument of Yahweh's rule and protection. Dynastic oracles inscribed on the free-standing pillars in front of the temple probably linked the permanence of the dynasty with the holy war power of Yahweh symbolized by the ark. Even the etiological story of the altar built by David on Araunah's threshing floor as the future site of the temple harmonized with the meaning of the ark as the symbol of Yahweh's gracious protection of Israel which calls for trust. Thus the essential elements for the subsequent development of Zion as a theological symbol were present in the cultic establishments of David and Solomon.

---

[1] On this ambiguity see the analysis of Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 62-65.

[2] Similarly Fretheim, *Ark*, pp. 218-219.

CHAPTER III. THE ETYMOLOGY, TOPOGRAPHICAL REFERENCE AND LITERARY DISTRIBUTION OF ZION AND RELATED TERMS

A. Origin of the Words Zion and Jerusalem

Approximately ten different proposed etymologies of the word *ṣiyyôn* have been collected and summarized by G. Fohrer.[1] His list is not exhaustive but serves to illustrate both the diversity of proposals and their general uncertainty. They include both non-Semitic roots (Elamite, Hurrian) and a number of possible Semitic roots (Arabic, Aramaic, Hebrew). The only root in the Hebrew Old Testament closely resembling *ṣiyyôn* is represented by the noun *ṣiyyâ*, "dry land, drought" (root *ṣyh*). There is a similar correspondence of the Syriac form of the word for Zion, *ṣehyôn*, to the Syriac verb *ṣhy*, "be dry, thirst." But the use of the term *ṣiyyôn* in the Old Testament in no way confirms such a meaning. The other most plausible traditional theory attempts to relate *ṣiyyôn* to an Arabic root *ṣyn*, "protect" thus giving the meaning "fortress, stronghold." This seems to fit the use of the word in a number of Old Testament passages, especially the phrase *m^{e}ṣûdat ṣiyyôn* (II Sam. 5:7 = I Chr. 11:5). But actually this phrase indicates that the word *ṣiyyôn* probably did not by itself carry the meaning "fortress," for this would render the term *m^{e}ṣûdat* tautologous and unnecessary, unless the writer was explaining the original meaning of the term *ṣiyyôn* because it had ceased to be common knowledge.

---

[1] "*Siōn, Ierousalēm, Hierosolyma, Hierosolymitēs*," §A. "Zion-Jerusalem im Alten Testament," *TWNT*, VII (1964), 293.

It seems more likely that the final *n* is afformative rather than radical and that the vocalization *ṣiyyôn* resembles the noun pattern *qiṭlôn* (originally *qaṭlān*) which often occurs in place names such as *gibᶜôn*, *ḥebrôn*, and *ḥešbôn*.[1] This confirms the suspicion that *ṣiyyôn* was simply a place name whose origin and meaning had already been forgotten long before the time of David. The fact that the article is never used with it further supports this assumption. Thus, even if a clearcut decision could be reached concerning the etymology of *ṣiyyôn*, its origin and original meaning would probably have been unknown and in no way significant in the time of David. In fact, the Old Testament has not even preserved any etiological stories or word plays suggesting a popular folk etymology of the word. Furthermore, no pre-Israelite occurrence of the term in extra-biblical sources has been found. Thus the conclusion must be that whatever meaning the word *ṣiyyôn* acquired as a religious symbol grew out of its earlier use as a place name.

The etymology of the term *yᵉrûšālēm* is much less obscure.[2] There is general agreement that the second element *šālēm* is the name of a deity attested in Canaanite and other northwest Semitic sources.[1] In one Ugaritic mythological text *šhr* and *šlm*, born as twin sons to *il*, are probably astral deities.[2] Elsewhere the element *šlm* appears in theophorous names in Canaanite and Assyrian (especially Kültepe) texts. The latter indicate a primary form *šalimu* and a derived variant form *šulmānu*.[3] Lewy believed that he had found evidence in an Amarna text of a *šulmān* temple in pre-Israelite Jerusalem. But this must be regarded as doubtful.[4] Also, according to Lewy, an Assyrian list of the names under which Ishtar is worshipped at various places calls the goddess *šulmānitu* (feminine counterpart of *šulmānu*) "the Ishtar of *Urusilimma*." But this passage is likewise of uncertain relevance.[1]

---

[1] This is pointed out by S. Krauss, "Zion and Jerusalem, A Linguistic and Historical Study," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, LXXVII (1945), 16-21. However he proposes an even more speculative derivation from the root *ṣby*, "beauty," by the assimilation of *ṣibyôn* to *ṣiyyôn*. This would make the word mean something like "place of beauty." But he can find very few analogies for the assimilation of the consonant combination *-by-* to *-yy-*. And his attempts to show that the word actually carried the assumed meaning "place of beauty" are hardly convincing. Most other suggested etymologies rest upon equally tenuous and speculative evidence.

[2] The perpetual qere, *yᵉrûšālayim*, of MT is, by general agreement, secondary and may be ignored in favor of the kethib, *yᵉrûsālēm*, which is supported by the LXX ierousalēm and the biblical Aramaic cognate *yᵉrûšᵉlēm*; cf. Fohrer, "*Siōn*," p. 295.

---

[1] The literature on the etymology of *y^{e}rušālēm* and on the god *šālēm* is considerable. For useful summary discussions of the evidence and further bibliography see H. S. Nyberg, "Studien zum Religionskampf im Alten Testament," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, XXXV (1938), 352-357, N. W. Porteous, "Shalem-Shalom," *Glasgow University Oriental Society Transactions*, X (1940-41), 1-2, E. Burrows, "The Name of Jerusalem," *The Gospel of the Infancy and Other Biblical Essays*, ed. E. F. Sutcliffe (The Bellarmine Series, 6; London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1941), pp. 118-123, Krauss, "Zion and Jerusalem," pp. 21-33, L. H. Vincent and A. M. Steve, *Jérusalem de l'Ancien Testament* (3 vols. in 2; Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1954, 1956), II-III, 611-614, Fohrer, "Siōn," pp. 295-297, M. Burrows, "Jerusalem," *IDB*, II, 843-844.

[2] *UM*, 52:52-53; cf. the name *šlm* in the list of deities, text 17:12. On *šhr* and *šlm* as astral deities see J. Gray, "Shalem (God)," *IDB*, IV, 303-304, and the extensive and sometimes tenuous evidence cited by T. H. Gaster, *Thespis: Ritual, Myth and Drama in the Ancient Near East* (New York: Henry Schuman, 1950), pp. 228-229.

[3] The evidence assembled by J. Lewy, "Les textes paléo-assyriens et l'Ancien Testament," *Revue de L'Histoire des Religions*, CX (1934), 60-65, is summarized by Nyberg, "Studien zum Religionskampf," pp. 352-353.

[4] This view was advanced on the basis of Amarna letter 290:14-17 by J. Lewy, "The Šulmān Temple in Jerusalem," *JBL*, XLIX (1940), 519-522, as cited with agreement by Vincent and Steve, *Jérusalem*, II-III, 612. But Albright transliterates the term in question as *bit-lahmi* (= Bethlehem) in *ANET*, p. 489. Fohrer, "*Siōn*," p. 297, note 46, also rejects Lewy's interpretation.

The derivation of the first element of *y^{e}rûšālēm* is less certain since the form of the word in several cognate languages points to a possible original form *’urušalim*.[2] Nevertheless most recent discussions regard the Hebrew form as the more original and relate the element *y^{e}rû* to the Hebrew verb *yrh* in the sense of "found, establish." The translation usually suggested is "foundation of (the god) *šālēm*."[3] Thus it is at least possible that a *šālēm* cult may still have existed in Jerusalem at the time of David's conquest or that *šālēm* was an alternative name for the Jerusalem deity *’ēl* *^{c}elyôn* attested in Genesis 14:18-22.[4] However, in contrast to the situation with the god *^{c}elyôn*, there is little evidence in the Old Testament that *šālēm* was used or recognized as a divine name or title.[1] Therefore it seems more likely that the original meaning of the name *y^{e}rûšālēm* was no longer remembered. The occasional word plays on *y^{e}rûšālēm* and the noun *šālôm* or the adjective *šālēm* can be sufficiently explained by the similarity of sound without requiring the assumption of concealed allusions to the divine name or title *šālem*.[2] The two occurrences of *šālēm* in place of *y^{e}rûšālēm* in Genesis 14:18 and Psalm 76:3 can be explained simply as shortenings intended to suggest the adjective and need not conceal any mythological or other tradition.

---

[1] Lewy, "Les textes paléo-assyriens," pp. 61-62, as cited with approval by Nyberg, "Studien zum Religionskampf," pp. 352-353, and Fohrer, "Siōn," p. 297. He interprets this as evidence of the presence of a *šulmānitu* cult in pre-Israelite Jerusalem. But H. Schmökel, *Heilige Hochzeit und Hoheslied* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1956), p. 98, as cited by Fohrer, p. 296, doubts the reading *urusilimma* in this text.

[2] The cognate forms listed by *KB* are: Accadian, *urusalim* (Amarna tablets) and *urusalimmu* (Sennacherib inscription); Egyptian, *urusalimum* (execration texts as interpreted by Albright); and Syriac *’urišlem*. A similar list is given by Fohrer, "*Siōn*," pp. 295-296. Only biblical Aramaic, *y^{e}rûš^{e}lēm*, and the Greek of the LXX and the New Testament, *ierousalēm*, agree with the Hebrew form.

[3] So Vincent and Steve, *Jérusalem*, II-III, 612, Fohrer, "*Siōn*," pp. 296-297, M. Burrows, "Jerusalem," pp. 843-844. Albright, as cited by Fohrer, has suggested translating the element *y^{e}rû* as a verbal form, either perfect or jussive. In contrast to these views E. Burrows, "The Name of Jerusalem," argues for *’urušalim* as the original form and relates the first element to the word *’ôr* meaning "light" or "flame." But he goes on to make the speculative suggestion that in the time of David this was purposely altered to the form *y^{e}rûšālēm*.

[4] This has been argued especially by Nyberg, "Studien zum Religionskampf," pp. 329-357, who brings together a great deal of very tenuous evidence in an attempt to demonstrate that *^{c}al*, *’el ^{c}elyôn*, *’el šadday*, *šalim*, *šulmānu* and *ṣidq* (*ṣedeq*), all represent alternative names or titles of one great northwest Semitic high god worshipped also by the early Israelites.

B. The Topographical Reference of the Words Zion and Jerusalem

The complex question of the archaeological and topographical history of Jerusalem lies mostly outside the scope of this study. The concern here will be only to summarize the information that bears most directly upon the topographical reference of the term Zion and its nearest synonyms. There has long been a scholarly consensus that the walled Jebusite town captured by David was located on the southeast hill.[1] Furthermore, the term *m^{e}ṣûdat ṣiyyôn* in the parallel accounts of David's conquest of Jerusalem seems to refer specifically to this walled town as it existed at that time (II Sam. 5:6-10 and I Chr. 11:4-9).[2] This is supported by the probable identification of the *ṣinnôr* mentioned in I Samuel 5:8 with the system of tunnels and shafts discovered by Warren in 1867 and apparently designed to make the water from the Gihon spring accessible to defenders inside the walled area.[3] The obscure words *w^{e}yigga^{c} baṣṣinnôr* (vs. 8), apparently referring to the means by which the victory was accomplished, have been interpreted in a variety of ways. But the most plausible and widely accepted interpretation is that of Simon who argues that it refers to a strategic action whereby David's men succeeded in reaching the Gihon water system and somehow cutting off the flow of water so that the defenders had no choice but to surrender.[1]

---

[1] The main evidence is the occurrence of Israelite personal names with the element *šlm*, especially David's sons *'abšālôm* and *š^{e}lōmōh*; cf. Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, p. 46. However, Absalom was born while David was still at Hebron (II Sam. 3:3). J. Gray, "Ashtoreth," *IDB*, I, 255-256, "Chemosh," *IDB*, I, 556, "Molech, Moloch," *IDB*, III, 422-423, "Shalem (God)," 303-304, and *Kings*, pp. 255-259, has argued for the identity of the pre-Israelite Jerusalem god *šālēm* with the Moabite god *^{c}štr kmš* (*KAI*, 181:17) and the Ammonite god *mlk* or *mlkm* whose cults Solomon is said to have established in Jerusalem (I Kgs. 11:5,7; cf. II Kgs. 23:13). Gray further identifies this deity with the Arabian Venus star god *^{c}attar* and the Ugaritic god *^{c}ttr*. The Canaanite goddess *^{c}štrt*/*^{c}trt* and the Mesopotamian goddess Ishtar are the feminine counterpart of the same god. However, the cults of *kmš*, *mlkm* and *^{c}štrt* which Solomon established are specifically described as foreign importations, indicating that they were not continuations of an already existing Jerusalem cult (I Kgs. 11:5-8; cf. 11:33 and II Kgs. 22:10,13).

[2] N. W. Porteous, "Jerusalem-Zion: The Growth of a Symbol," *Verbannung und Heimkehr*, ed. A. Kuschke (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1961), pp. 235-252, and "Shalem-Shalom," pp. 1-7, studies the frequent occurrence of words from the roots *šlm* and *ṣdq* in connection with Jerusalem. He thinks this originated in the old *šālēm* cult, but concedes that such connections were soon forgotten so that the name *y^{e}rûšālēm* was thought of as meaning simply "city of peace."

---

[1] For an extended discussion of the scholarly debate in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries which led to the abandonment of the traditional location of the City of David on the southwest hill in favor of the now universally accepted location on the southeast hill see J. Simon, *Jerusalem in the Old Testament: Researches and Theories* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1952), chap. 2. For recent excavations further confirming this see K. M. Kenyon, "Excavations in Jerusalem 1961-1963," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, XXVII (1964), 34-52, and Gray, *Kings*, p. 227.

[2] See the discussion of these passages in Simon, *Jerusalem*, pp. 60-64, which convincingly refutes the view of Vincent that *mṣdt ṣywn* referred only to a single acropolis fortress within the walled town. G. A. Barrois, "Zion," *IDB*, IV, 959, agrees with Simon against Vincent.

[3] For a detailed description and diagram of this water system see Simon, *Jerusalem*, pp. 165-168. For over-all perspective see the excellent map of the ancient water works of Jerusalem in G. A. Barrois, "Siloam," *IDB*, IV, 353. The old difficulty posed by the fact that the upper entrance to this system was still a great distance outside the line of the wall along the eastern crest of the southeast hill has now been overcome. Recent excavation has unearthed a wall lying part way down the slope and identified it as the eastern wall of the Jebusite town. Its position is between the Gihon itself and the upper entrance to the shaft and tunnel system. On this see Kenyon, "Excavations in Jerusalem," Fig. 2, p. 35, and discussion, pp. 36-40.

The same two passages indicate quite clearly that *m^{e}ṣûdat ṣiyyôn* was an older pre-Davidic name for the walled town, and that the new name, City of David (*^{c}îr dāwid*), had an identical topographical reference (II Sam. 5:7,9; cf. I Chr. 11:5,7).[2] The story of David bringing the ark to the City of David and the sequel telling of Solomon moving it from the City of David to the temple both confirm this identification. The term City of David is used repeatedly in the story of David bringing the ark, showing quite clearly that the tent sanctuary established for the ark was within the area designated by this term (II Sam. 6:10,12,16-17; cf. I Chr. 13:13; 15:1,29; 16:1). The story of Solomon installing the ark in the temple shows equally clearly that the ark was removed from the City of David and that the temple was outside the area designated by that term (I Kgs. 8:1; cf. Chr. 5:2). Here *^{c}îr dawid* is identified by the parenthetical explanation *hîʾ ṣiyyôn*, just the reverse of the situation in II

---

[1] Simon, *Jerusalem*, pp. 168-173. This interpretation is accepted by Hertzberg, *Samuel*, pp. 268-269, and M. Burrows, "Jerusalem," p. 848. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 38-39, cites with approval a similar view stated by H. J. Stoebe, "Die Einnahme Jerusalems und die Ṣinnôr," *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, LXXIII (1957), 99. This hypothesis is much more plausible than the older and once popular view attributed by Simon to Vincent that Joab and his men climbed up through the water shaft and stormed the fortress by surprise from within.

[2] On the topographical identity of the terms *m^{e}ṣûdat ṣiyyôn* and *^{c}îr dāwid* see especially Simon, *Jerusalem*, p. 61. On the renaming of the city by David as an act of assuming legal possession see Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 39, and the possible reference to the same custom in II Sam. 12:28.

Samuel 6:7 where *m^eṣûdat ṣiyyôn* is identified by the parenthetical explanation *hî' ^{c}îr dāwid*. A clear distinction between the City of David and the area of Solomon's new building complex is also evident in the references to Solomon's preparation of special quarters for Pharaoh's daughter (I Kgs. 3:1; 9:24; cf. 7:8).

Since the evidence is clear that Zion and the City of David were synonymous in their topographical reference prior to and even after the building of the temple and the expansion of the walled area to the northeast hill by Solomon, the problem is to explain how they came to be differentiated from one another both in topographical reference and in religious connotation. The term City of David seems to continue to be used to refer specifically to the old part of the city on the southeast hill, sometimes with reference to its fortifications and water works,[1] but more frequently in the formula-like statements in Kings and Chronicles specifying the burial place of the kings.[2] In contrast to City of David, the term Zion is elsewhere used almost entirely in poetic contexts and with a broader or less precisely discernible topographical reference. Sometimes it seems to be synonymous with Jerusalem, designating the entire inhabited city or the city area including the temple hill. Sometimes it seems to refer primarily to the sacred area associated with the temple, thus representing a clear displacement of the original topographical reference of the word.[1] This suggests that as the term City of David became established it gradually replaced Zion as the term referring specifically to the old part of the city on the southeast hill. As a slightly archaic term Zion then came to be used with a less precise topographical reference more or less synonymous with Jerusalem. The problem then is to explain how it came to be used in a more specialized way than Jerusalem to refer to the sacred significance of the city and the temple area.

---

[1] I Kgs. 11:27; Is. 22:9; II Chr. 32:5,30; 33:14; Neh. 12:37.

[2] I Kgs. 2:10; 11:43; 14:31; 15:8,24; 22:51; II Kgs. 8:24; 9:28; 12:22; 14:20; 15:7,38; 16:20; and the parallels in Chronicles, also the burial of the priest Jehoida, II Chr. 24:16. On the continuing use of the term City of David to refer to the original area of the city see G. A. Barrois, "David, City of," *IDB*, I, 782. For a detailed discussion of these passages and of the archaeological data relating to the royal tombs see Simon, *Jerusalem*, pp. 194-225.

The precise topographical reference of the term Jerusalem is less easy to determine than in the case of Zion and City of David. But the meager evidence available indicates that it was a somewhat broader and less precise term.[2] Several times *hî' y^{e}rûšālēm* occurs as an explanatory note following *y^{e}bûs* or *hay^{e}bûsî* in somewhat the same way as *ṣiyyôn* and *^{c}îr dāwid* are equated with one another in the passages discussed above. The description of the northern boundary of Judah says *w^{ec}ālâ hagg^{e}bûl gê ben-hinnom 'el-ketep hay^{e}bûsî minnegeb hî' y^{e}rûšālēm*, implying that the territory of the Jebusites was bounded on the south by the Hinnom Valley (Josh. 15:8). This points rather clearly to the southwest hill as that portion of the territory of the Jebusites which touched the boundary of Judah but gives no clues concerning the extent of Jebusite territory in other directions. The explanatory note *hîʼ y^{e}rûšālēm* which is lacking in the corresponding description of the southern boundary of Benjamin (Josh. 18:16) is probably an early gloss implying that the geographical reference of Jerusalem is the same. Nowhere is there a similar equation of Jebus or the Jebusite with Zion. The two nearly identical notes concerning the inability of Judah and/or Benjamin to dislodge the Jebusites make the same equation (Josh. 15:63; Jud. 1:21). However, these passages say *hay^{e}bûsî yôš^{e}bê y^{e}rûšālēm*, and then reinforce this by saying *wayyēšeb hay^{e}bûsî* ... *bîrûšālēm ^{c}ad hayyôm hazzeh*, which strongly emphasizes the identity of Jerusalem as the territory traditionally occupied by the Jebusites. The same equation occurs in the account of the Levite passing by Jebus as he is returning home from Bethlehem with his concubine, though no clear indication is given as to the geographical extent of the territory so designated (Jud. 19:10-11).

---

[1] Fohrer, "*Siōn*," p. 292, counts more than 40 of the 154 occurrences of *ṣiyyôn* in the *MT* as in synonymous parallelism with *y^{e}rûsālēm*. On the shift of topographical reference see Fohrer, pp. 293-294, 307-308, and Barrois, "Zion," p. 959.

[2] For an extended discussion of the texts which may be used in support of such a view see Simon, *Jerusalem*, pp. 242-249. Simon's argument for the expansion of the walled area to the western hill in the time of Solomon is not a necessary corollary of his argument that the topographical reference of the term *y^{e}rûšālēm* included the southwestern hill. Simon's view that there was an important but unwalled town area on the southwest hill goes too far in the direction of Dalman's generally discredited "twin cities" theory.

The parallel accounts of David's conquest of Jerusalem again identify Jerusalem as the territory occupied by the Jebusites, *wayēlek* ... *y^{e}rûšālēm ʼel-hay^{e}bûsî yôšeb hāʼāreṣ* (II Sam. 5:6; cf. I Chr. 11:4). These passages have both equations, *y^{e}bûs* = *y^{e}rûšālēm* and *m^{e}ṣûdat ṣiyyôn* = *^{c}îr dāwid*, but seem to distinguish the two pairs from one another. Thus David leads his men to Jerusalem, that is the territory of the Jebusites, but fights the battle specifically to gain control of *m^{e}ṣûdat ṣiyyôn*, that is the walled area on the southeast hill which he renamed *^{c}îr dāwid*. This implies that Jerusalem, as the designation of a geographical and political entity, included not only the fortified town but also the local territory on adjacent hills which belonged to the Jebusite inhabitants, presumably as farming area or perhaps as small and dependent outlying peasant villages.[1] The references to Araunah the Jebusite owning a threshing floor on the hill north of the fortified town illustrates this distinction (II Sam. 24:16,18; cf. I Chr. 21:15,18,28; II Chr. 3:1).

The continuing distinction between Jerusalem and City of David is indicated in a number of passages. After his marriage to the daughter of the Pharaoh, Solomon is said to have brought her into the City of David until he had completed the building of the palace and temple complex to the north including the "wall of Jerusalem" (I Kgs. 3:1; cf. 9:15,24).[2] In two contexts telling of people coming to Jerusalem from a distance for a specific purpose the narrator then uses the term City of David to define more precisely the locale of a specific action. Thus when Solomon assembles the representatives of Israel to dedicate the temple they come to Jerusalem, but the ceremonial procession with the ark moves specifically from *ᶜîr dāwid* = *siyyôn* to the temple (I Kgs. 8:1-6). Similarly King Ahaziah's body is brought from Megiddo to Jerusalem and then buried specifically in the City of David (II Kgs. 9:28; cf. 14:20). The same distinction is apparent in the stereotyped formulas used in the book of

---

[1] Cf. A. Alt, "Das Taltor von Jerusalem" (1928), *KS*, III, 331-332, who rejects any form of Dalman's "Doppelstadt" theory but grants the distinction between the fortified town on the southeast hill and the larger "Besitzrecht" of its inhabitants which could have included the western hill. Likewise Fohrer, "*Siōn*," p. 297, concludes that from the beginning Jerusalem was the "Gesamtname" referring to the "ganze Siedlung" in contrast to the "Teilbezeichnungen" *siyyôn* and *ᶜîr dāwid*.

[2] Simon, *Jerusalem*, pp. 242-243, uses these passages as the starting point for his argument that Solomon extended the walled area across the central valley to include part or all of the western hill. But the expression *hômat yᵉrûšālēm sābîb* may be taken more naturally in the context as referring to the wall enclosing the new palace and temple complex. The fact that it is called "wall of Jerusalem" does not mean necessarily that it enclosed the whole area designated by the term Jerusalem, but could mean only that it pertained to Jerusalem as a larger entity rather than to the smaller and more precisely defined entity City of David.

Kings to introduce and conclude the account of each king's reign which say typically that the king reigned so many years in Jerusalem and that he was buried in the City of David.[1]

C. The Distribution of the Terms Zion and Jerusalem

Table One on the following two pages gives comparative statistical information on the occurrence and frequency of the words Zion and Jerusalem in each book of the Old Testament. Both words are lacking in several books such as the Pentateuch and some of the wisdom and prophetic books because the general subject matter provides little or no occasion for them to occur. More significant are the striking differences of distribution between the two words in the books where there is occasion for them to occur. Zion occurs hardly at all in narrative and prose contexts. Jerusalem is thus the term normally used in narrative contexts to refer to the city as a geographical and political entity whether the reference is primarily to its location, its inhabitants, its political and military functions, or its religious and cultic establishments. This explains why Jerusalem occurs nearly four and a half times more often than Zion in the Old Testament as a whole.

In sharp contrast, Zion occurs twice as often as Jerusalem in the Psalms and Lamentations, which together account for more than one-third of all its Old Testament occurrences. This indicates that Zion was the preferred word in cultic poetry. In psalms which can reasonably be regarded as pre-exilic, Zion occurs fifteen times and Jerusalem only

---

[1] I Kgs. 2:10-11 (David); 11:42-43 (Solomon); 14:21,31 (Rehoboam); 15:2,8 (Abijam); 15:9,24 (Asa); 22:42,50 (Jehoshaphat); I Kgs. 8:17,24 (Jehoram); 8:25; 9:28 (Ahaziah); 12:1,21 (Joash); 14:2,20 (Amaziah); 15:2,7 (Azariah); 15:33,38 (Jotham); 16:2,20 (Ahaz).

TABLE ONE: OCCURRENCES OF ZION AND JERUSALEM[1]

Book	Pages	ZION Occurrences	ZION Per Page	JERUSALEM Occurrences	JERUSALEM Per Page	Ratio of Zion to Jerusalem
Genesis	87	—	—	—	—	—
Exodus	72	—	—	—	—	—
Leviticus	51	—	—	—	—	—
Numbers	72	—	—	—	—	—
Deuteronomy	63	—	—	—	—	—
Joshua	45	—	—	9	.2	0
Judges	43	—	—	5	.1	0
Samuel	106	1	.01	31	.3	.032
Kings	111	3	.03	90	.8	.033
Isaiah	75	47	.6	49	.7	1.0
Jeremiah	95	17	.2	102	1.1	.17
Ezekiel	78	—	—	26	.3	0
Hosea	16	—	—	—	—	—
Joel	4.3	7	1.6	6	1.4	1.2
Amos	9.0	2	.2	2	.2	1.0

---

[1] Word counts are from Fohrer, "*Siōn*," pp. 292, 294. In addition *ṣiyyôn* has been checked in Mandelkern, *Concordantiae*, II, 1507-1508. Page counts were made in *SPR TWRH NBY'YM WKTWBYM* (New York: Hebrew Publishing Co., n.d.), an edition of MT which prints all books in prose form, thereby giving pages of more nearly equal content than *BH*. Lengths of books with fewer than ten pages were estimated to the nearest tenth of a page, longer ones to the nearest page.

TABLE ONE, CONTINUED

Book	Pages	ZION Occurrences	ZION Per Page	JERUSALEM Occurrences	JERUSALEM Per Page	Ratio of Zion to Jerusalem
Obadiah	1.2	2	1.7	2	1.7	1.0
Jonah	3.5	—	—	—	—	—
Micah	6.4	9	1.4	8	1.3	1.1
Nahum	2.6	—	—	—	—	—
Habakkuk	2.9	—	—	—	—	—
Zephaniah	3.6	2	.6	4	1.1	.50
Haggai	2.6	—	—	—	—	—
Zechariah	14	8	.6	39	2.8	.21
Malachi	3.9	—	—	2	.5	0
Psalms	94	38	.4	17	.2	2.2
Job	36	—	—	—	—	—
Proverbs	31	—	—	—	—	—
Ruth	5.6	—	—	—	—	—
Canticles	5.9	1	.2	8	1.4	.13
Lamentations	6.9	15	2.2	7	1.0	2.1
Ecclesiastes	13	—	—	5	.4	0
Esther	14	—	—	1	.07	0
Daniel	27	—	—	10	.4	0
Ezra-Nehemiah	42	—	—	86	2.0	0
Chronicles	109	2	.02	151	1.4	.013
Totals	1352	154	.11	660	.49	.23

four.[1] These fifteen pre-exilic occurrences of Zion are all in three closely related types of psalms, hymns of Yahweh's kingship (97; 99), royal psalms (2; 20; 110; 132), and Zion hymns (48; 76; 84), or in other hymnic psalms partially akin to these (50; 65; 78; 149). The four pre-exilic occurrences of Jerusalem are also in psalms akin either to the hymns of Yahweh's kingship (68) or to the Zion hymns (122). A study of the psalms belonging to or akin to these three groups should therefore reveal the primary significance of Zion as a theological symbol during the period of the monarchy.

Psalms which must probably be considered exilic or postexilic, together with the book of Lamentations, reveal a continuing preference for Zion over Jerusalem in cultic poetry even though the two words occur in a greater variety of psalm types.[2] Zion continues to be more frequent with 38 occurrences compared to Jerusalem with 20 occurrences. In nine cases Jerusalem occurs either as the synonymous parallel of Zion or in an immediately adjacent poetic line.[3] In all but two of these cases Zion precedes Jerusalem which is used primarily for the sake of parallelism.

---

[1] The following are counted as pre-exilic occurrences of Zion: Pss. 2:6; 20:3; 48:3,12,13; 50:2; 65:2; 76:3; 78:68; 84:8; 97:8; 99:2; 110:2; 132:13; 149:2. The following are counted as pre-exilic occurrences of Jerusalem: Pss. 68:30; 122:2,3,6. Except for 97:8 I have followed the suggestions of Kraus, Psalmen, whose position is usually moderate.

[2] The following are counted as exilic or postexilic occurrences of Zion: Pss. 9:12,15; 14:7 = 53:7; 51:20; 69:36; 74:2; 87:2,5; 102:14,17, 22; 125:1; 126:1; 128:5; 129:5; 133:3; 134:3; 135:21; 137:1,3; 146:10; 147:12; Lam. 1:4,6,17; 2:1,4,6,8,10,13,18; 4:2,11,22; 5:11,18. The following are counted as exilic or postexilic occurrences of Jerusalem: Pss. 51:20; 79:1,3; 102:22; 116:19; 125:2; 128:5; 135:21; 137:5,6,7; 147:2,12; Lam. 1:7,8,17; 2:10,13,15; 4:12. The psalm dates suggested by Kraus, Psalmen, have again been followed.

[3] Pss. 51:20; 102:22; 125:1-2; 128:5; 135:21; 147:12; Lam. 1:17; 2:10,13.

Seven other occurrences of Jerusalem occur closely following occurrences of Zion, perhaps mainly for stylistic variation, whereas only once does Jerusalem precede Zion in the same psalm.[1] Jerusalem occurs in only two exilic or postexilic psalms which lack Zion completely.[2] The predominant exilic and postexilic psalm type using these two words is the community lament (Pss. 74; 79; Lam. 1; 2; 4; 5) or psalm contexts akin to this type (Pss. 9-10; 51; 69; 102; 125; 126; 129; 137).

The book of Isaiah accounts for close to another third of the occurrences of Zion (47), but has about the same number of occurrences of Jerusalem (49). Furthermore, both terms occur in poetic and oracle contexts in all major divisions and strata of the book as shown in Table Two, below.

TABLE TWO: DISTRIBUTION OF ZION AND JERUSALEM IN ISAIAH[3]

	Zion	Jerusalem
Genuine Isaiah in 1-39	13	14
Later Material in 1-23; 28-32	10	6
Isaiah 24-27; 33-35	6	3
Isaiah 40-55	11	10
Isaiah 56-66	7	9
Prose superscriptions and narratives	0	7
Totals	47	49

---

[1] Zion has preceded the occurrences of Jerusalem in Ps. 137:5,6,7; Lam. 1:7,8; 2:15; 4:12. In 147:2 Jerusalem occurs earlier than Zion.

[2] Pss. 79:1,3; 116:19.

[3] In determining which passages to regard as genuine I have relied primarily upon Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 149-381, J. Bright, "Isaiah--I," PCB, pp. 489-515, Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 304-330, and Weiser, The

Again, however, there are significant distinctions of usage. Jerusalem, but never Zion, is used in prose superscriptions and in prose narrative passages where Isaiah parallels II Kings 18-20. In "genuine Isaiah" passages Jerusalem is placed in synonymous parallelism with Judah four times and with Samaria twice, Jerusalem always preceding.[1] Once it follows the phrase "the two houses of Israel" as a synonymous parallel (8:14). In other cases also Jerusalem refers primarily to the city as a geographical and political entity and/or to its inhabitants as a people comparable to Judah or Samaria as in the phrases *yôšēb y^{e}rûšālēm* (8:14; 22:21) and *môš^{e}lê* *hā^{c}ām* *hazzeh* *'^{a}šer* *bîrûšālēm* (28:14), or in a prosaic passage referring to Jerusalem's buildings and fortifications (22:10). The remaining occurrences of Jerusalem in "genuine Isaiah" are in synonymous parallelism with Zion. In three cases Zion is the first term (10:32; 31:5,9; 37:22), whereas Jerusalem precedes only once (37:32).

Zion alone in "genuine Isaiah" sometimes appears to mean nothing

---

Old *Testament*, pp. 184-197. The following occurrences of Zion are counted as genuine Isaiah: 1:8; 3:16,17; 8:18; 10:24,32; 14:32; 28:16; 29:8; 31:4, 9; 37:22,31. The following occurrences of Jerusalem are counted as genuine Isaiah: 3:1,8; 5:3; 8:14; 10:10,11,32; 22:10,21; 28:14; 31:5,9; 37:22, 32. The following occurrences of Zion in 1-23; 28-32 are considered later than Isaiah: 1:27; 2:3; 4:3,4,5; 10:12; 12:6; 16:1; 18:7; 30:19. The following occurrences of Jerusalem in these sections are considered later than Isaiah: 2:3; 4:3,3,4; 10:12; 30:19. The occurrences of Zion in 24-27; 33-35 are: 24:23; 33:5,14,20; 34:8; 35:10. The occurrences of Jerusalem in these sections are: 24:23; 27:13; 33:20. The occurrences of Zion in 40-55 are: 40:9; 41:27; 46:13; 49:14; 51:3,11,16; 52:1,2,7,8. The occurrences of Jerusalem in this section are: 40:2,9; 41:27; 44:26,28; 51:17; 52:1,2,9,9. The occurrences of Zion in 56-66 are: 59:20; 60:14; 61:3; 62:1,11; 64:9; 66:8. The occurrences of Jerusalem are: 62:1,6,7; 64:9; 65:18,19; 66:10,13,20. The occurrences of Jerusalem in prose superscriptions are: 1:1; 2:1. Occurrences in narrative passages parallel to II Kgs. 18-20 are: 7:1; 36:2,7,20; 37:10.

[1] With Judah: 3:1,8; 5:3; 22:21. With Samaria: 10:10,11.

significantly different from Jerusalem as a corporate geographical and political entity, as in the phrase *b^{e}nôt ṣiyyôn* (3:16,17). In some cases, however, Zion is personified in the phrase *bat-siyyôn* (1:8; 10:32 following the qere), or *b^{e}tûlat bat-siyyôn* (37:22), the latter calling forth *bat-y^{e}rûšālēm* as its synonymous parallel, a phrase which occurs in no other pre-exilic context. Likewise, the phrases *har-siyyôn* (8:18; 29:8; 31:4; 37:31) and *har bat-ṣiyyôn* (10:32) have no equivalent expression in "genuine Isaiah" using the term Jerusalem. But there is no indication that these phrases mean anything significantly different from *ṣiyyôn* alone (10:24; 14:32; 28:16; 31:9). More important is the fact that Zion occurs in certain emphatic formula-like sayings (8:18; 14:32; 28:16; 31:9) and as the object of reproaches and threats (1:8; 3:16,17; 10:32; 31:4) but also of promised deliverance (10:24; 29:8; 31:9; 37:22,31).

In later parts of the book of Isaiah Zion and Jerusalem often occur in synonymous parallelism with Zion nearly always the prior term.[1] But in contexts where one or the other term occurs alone, significant distinctions of usage are less apparent. The occurrence of Zion in all strata of the book indicates that it represented an important theme not only for Isaiah but for subsequent generations of Isaiah traditionists.

In the book of Micah, as in Isaiah, Jerusalem, but never Zion, is sometimes paired with Judah (1:9) or Samaria (1:1,5). In most other cases Jerusalem occurs in synonymous parallelism following Zion (3:10,12; 4:2,8). In only one case does it precede Zion (1:12-13). Notable in the book of Micah is the fact that all occurrences of both terms in "genuine Micah" are threatening while most occurrences in later passages are promises.[1]

---

[1] Zion precedes in 2:3; 4:3,4; 10:12; 24:23; 30:19; 33:20; 40:9; 41:27; 52:1; 62:1; 64:9. Jerusalem precedes in 52:2, probably for chiastic contrast with 52:1.

In striking contrast are the books of Jeremiah where Jerusalem outnumbers Zion six to one, Ezekiel where Zion completely disappears, and Zechariah where Jerusalem outnumbers Zion five to one. Thus, apart from the book of Isaiah, Zion tends to disappear from the prophetic literature of the seventh and sixth centuries. Only in the book of Joel does it return to prominence.

D. Summary

Both Zion and Jerusalem were place names inherited by the Israelites from their Canaanite predecessors. The original meanings of the two words were probably unknown. Though the name Jerusalem derives from the name of the Canaanite deity Shalem, there is little evidence that this was ever of religious significance to the Israelites.

Jerusalem and Zion did differ originally in topographical reference, Zion referring more narrowly to the fortified town on the southeast hill, and Jerusalem more broadly to the town plus the local surrounding area directly dependent upon it. When the fortified town was renamed City of David, this displaced the name Zion which became primarily a poetic word used in cultic poetry. Though its precise topographical reference can seldom be discerned in such contexts, its normal synonymous parallel was Jerusalem rather than City of David. When Zion occurs, the focal point of interest is often the temple or temple hill. Thus its topographical reference was either broadened or displaced from the old walled area on the southeast hill to include the new walled complex of Solomonic buildings on the northeast hill. The main distinction between Zion and Jerusalem was thus no longer topographic. Instead, Jerusalem referred primarily to the city as a political entity, whereas Zion referred to its sacred significance as the place of the temple and its cult in which Yahweh's kingship and the authority of the Davidic dynasty were celebrated.

---

[1] In genuine Micah Zion occurs in 1:13; 3:10,12, and Jerusalem in 1:5,9,12; 3:10,12. In passages later than Micah Zion occurs in 4:2,7,8, 10,11,13, and Jerusalem in 4:2,8. In determining which passages to regard as genuine I have relied primarily upon Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, pp. 407-413, Weiser, *The Old Testament*, pp. 252-255, D. W. Thomas, "Micah," *PCB*, pp. 630-634. According to some interpreters 4:10a may be a fragment of a genuine threat oracle of Micah; cf. W. Harrelson, *Interpreting the Old Testament* (New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 367.

Any hypothesis concerning the development of Zion as a theological symbol must explain several observed facts concerning its irregular occurrence and distribution both in cultic poetry and in the prophetic books. Why are its earliest occurrences mostly in psalms dealing either with the theme of Yahweh's kingship, the authority of the Davidic dynasty or with Zion itself? Why, in later cultic poetry, does it appear primarily in community laments? Why does the ratio between the occurrences of Zion and of Jerusalem vary so much from one prophetic book to another? Why especially does Zion occur prominently in all major strata of Isaiah whereas it is relatively unimportant in Jeremiah and totally absent from Ezekiel? Among the smaller prophetic books why is it an important term mainly in Micah and Joel? How was the significance of Zion as a theological symbol in these sources related to the cultic establishments of David and Solomon at Zion centering in the ark and its traditions? The following chapters will reconstruct the development of Zion as a theological symbol with a view to answering questions of this kind.

CHAPTER IV. THE ARK AS A HOLY WAR SYMBOL AND THE KINGSHIP OF YAHWEH AT ZION IN THE PSALMS

This section will be based primarily upon the psalms of Yahweh's kingship together with other relevant psalms of a hymnic type which can be plausibly assigned to the period of the monarchy. In assigning approximate dates to these psalms I have usually followed the guidance of the commentaries of Weiser and Kraus which best represent contemporary trends in the interpretation of the psalms.[1] For comparison I have consulted, but seldom mention, the commentary of Oesterley which often reflects an older critical viewpoint with regard to dating.[2]

As cultic compositions the psalms share the relative conservatism typical of cultic materials. Thus even a psalm composed at a relatively late period may reflect traditional themes handed down from an earlier period. The cumulative evidence discussed in chapter two points to the time of David and Solomon as the creative period when the Yahwistic cultus of Jerusalem and its associated theological themes were formulated and fixed in traditional form.[3] Few of the psalms may have been composed at such an early time in the form in which we now have them.[4] Nevertheless it is reasonable to assume that many of them reflect in essence the Davidic and Solomonic religious synthesis which continued for many generations as the traditional basis of the Jerusalem temple cult.

---

[1] Weiser, Psalms, and Kraus, Psalmen.

[2] W. O. E. Oesterley, The Psalms, Translated with Text-Critical and Exegetical Notes (London: S.P.C.K., 1939).

[3] For a many-sided survey of the period of the united monarchy as the supremely creative period in Israel's cultural development see von Rad, Theology, I, 36-56.

[4] Several scholars in recent years have made lists of psalms which they date provisionally as early as the time of the united monarchy. Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, p. 129, lists Pss. 18,

A. The Ark and the Holy War Theophany Tradition in Psalm 68

Psalm 68 is an appropriate place to begin both because of its generally recognized antiquity and because it has repeated allusions to the ark and related holy war themes associated with allusions to Jerusalem and the temple. One can hardly reconstruct a clearly developing train of thought or cultic progression other than an implied procession of the ark.[1] Since it may be dated to the period of the united monarchy with greater confidence than almost any other psalm, Psalm 68 probably reflects in a dependable way the complex of themes associated with the ark when it was brought to Jerusalem and established as the central symbol of

---

29, 45, and especially 68, as tenth century, and also stresses the "Canaanitisms" of 88 and 89 as evidence of a very early date. Mowinckel, Psalms, II, 153, 257-259, grants the possibility of such an early date for 68 and 110 and perhaps also for 19A, 29 and 60. Kraus, Psalmen, I, lvii-lix, concedes possible pre-Davidic dates for 29, 18 and 68 and stresses the importance of 110 and 132 as reflecting traditions from the time of David. M. Dahood, Psalms 1-50: Introduction, Translation and Notes (Anchor Bible, 16; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1966), pp. xxix-xxx, considers all the following as possibly dating to the Davidic period: 2, 16, 18, 29, 60, 68, 82, 108, 110. Thus all four agree on such an early date for Pss. 29 and 68. Three of the four agree on Pss. 18 and 110.

[1] On the psalm as an ark processional see Fretheim, Ark, pp. 151-164. Johnson, Sacral Kingship, pp. 68-77, and Mowinckel, Psalms, I, 172-174, both use Ps. 68 as an important basis for their respective attempts to reconstruct the ritual sequence of the autumn festival. But this attempt is rendered problematic not only by the great difficulties of interpretation inherent in the psalm itself but also by the probable wide differences in age among this and the various other psalms which they attempt to fit together into a cultic sequence.

the Yahwistic cult of David and Solomon.[1] The psalm is loosely structured and contains several close verbal parallels to other ancient passages, indicating that it was composed in part by the free use of small portions of older cultic poems and songs brought to Jerusalem in oral tradition form along with the ark. The ancient ark chant of Numbers 10:35 (cf. vs. 2) and fragments resembling Judges 5:4-5,16a (cf. vss. 8-9, 14a) have been freely modified. And the parallels with Deuteronomy 33:2,6 (cf. vss. 18,34-35) are incomplete, indicating that Psalm 68 was dependent on oral tradition sources rather than written texts.[2]

---

[1] Kraus, Psalmen, I, 470-471, and Worship, pp. 167-172, developing a suggestion made first by S. Mowinckel, Der achtundsechzigste Psalm (Avhandlinger utgitt av Det Norske Videnkaps-Akademi i Oslo, II, Hist.-Filos. Klasse 1953, No. 1; Oslo: Dybwad, 1953), argues that the main portion of this psalm had its original setting in the north Israelite Yahwistic cult on Mt. Tabor. The main items of evidence are the parallels with the Song of Deborah in Jud. 5 and the references to the tribes of Zebulun and Naphtali (vss. 8-11,27). He regards the term har-bāšān (vs. 16) as a traditional term like ṣāpôn referring to the mountain of the gods which is here applied to Tabor. The reference to the ascendancy of Benjamin (vs. 28) indicates a date in the time of Saul. Kraus regards the last part of the psalm (vss. 29-35) as an expansion adapting the psalm to Jerusalem after the fall of the Northern Kingdom. But the indirect allusions to the ark make it more probable that the entire psalm represents an adaptation of traditions associated with the ark at Shiloh to the Jerusalem cult of David and Solomon. That the psalm also preserves traditional material deriving ultimately from Mt. Tabor is a plausible but more tenuous hypothesis. Cf. Mowinckel, Psalms, II, 152-153.

[2] Oesterley, Psalms, pp. 320-327, treats Ps. 68 as a collection of quotations from different poems strung together in a haphazard way. W. F. Albright, "A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems (Psalm LXVIII)," Hebrew Union College Annual, XXIII (1950-51), 1-39, modifies this theory by suggesting that the psalm is a collection of opening lines or incipits of various poems. These theories go too far in fragmentizing the psalm and fail to recognize the elements of unity evident in the recurrence of various themes and stylistic features; cf. Fretheim, Ark, pp. 154-157. The later existence of written collections of holy war poetry deriving partly from premonarchic traditional sources is shown by the passages quoted in later writings from the "Book of the Wars of Yahweh" (Num. 21:14) and from the "Book of Jashar" (Josh. 10:13; II Sam. 1:18; cf. I Kgs. 8:53 LXX). This material was probably based on oral tradition brought to

Although Psalm 68 is not a holy war victory hymn of the same kind as the Song of Deborah in Joshua 5, one of its major recurring themes is the celebration of Yahweh's holy war power and theophanic manifestations.[1] In several cases the presence of the ark as the symbol of Yahweh's victorious intervention or presence seems to be implied.[2] The psalm opens with a variant form of the ancient ark chant of Numbers 10:35 invoking Yahweh's holy war intervention (vs. 2).[3] This merges into a quick and allusive portrayal of his victorious theophany intervention (vss. 3-4), shifting next to a hymnic call to praise. This applies the Canaanite divine title *rôkēb* *bā^{ca}rābôt* to Yahweh (vs. 5), a title which may have been connected especially with the cherubim as a theophany symbol of Canaanite origin associated with the ark in the Yahwistic cult

---

Jerusalem during the united monarchy and collected in written form in connection with the learned literary activities associated with the temple and royal court at Jerusalem during or soon after the united monarchy. On these collections see the discussions by Kraft, "Jashar, Book of," p. 803, R. C. Dentan, "Wars of the Lord, Book of the," *IDB*, IV, 805, and Weiser, *The Old Testament*, p. 31.

[1] See Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 469, for a criticism of attempts to classify this as a *Siegeslied* on the analogy of Jud. 5.

[2] On this see for example the remarks of Schmid, "Kulttraditionen," pp. 193-194.

[3] On Num. 10:35-36 see chap. 1, §A. The chant in Num. 10:35 is as follows:

qûmâ *yhwh* *w^{e}yāpûṣû* *'ôy^{e}beykā* / *w^{e}yānûsû* *m^{e}san^{e}'eykā* *mippāneykā*

In Ps. 68:2 it is modified as follows, restoring *yhwh* for MT *'^{e}lôhîm*:

yāqûm *yhwh* *yāpûṣû* *'ôy^{e}bāyw* / *w^{e}yānûsû* *m^{e}san^{e}'āyw* *mippānāyw*

The shift is basically from a second person style invocation addressed to Yahweh to a third person style which may be translated either as an invocation (jussives) or a descriptive recital (imperfects). The second option is more consistent with the style of the rest of the poem which relates various praiseworthy deeds of Yahweh.

at Shiloh.[1] Here it is placed in synonymous parallelism with *š^{e}mô* preceding and following and with *l^{e}pānāyw* following, all probably alluding to the presence and symbolism of the ark.[2]

The next major section of the psalm begins with a theophany passage closely parallel to a passage in the Song of Deborah, though the two are significantly different in meaning because of small differences in wording (vss. 8-9).[3] Judges 5:4-5 pictures Yahweh's theophany presence as coming from Sinai in the region of Seir and Edom to manifest itself victoriously on Israel's behalf against the kings of Canaan. But in Psalm 68:8-11 this is transformed into a brief *heilsgeschichtlich* summary mentioning the exodus and the march through the wilderness but climaxing with a picture of Yahweh as a weather god dispensing rain upon the land which is his possession, here referred to by the term *naḥ^{a}lāt^{e}kā* which is probably Canaanite in background.[4] This combination of themes may be correlated with the traditional symbolism of the ark and cherubim as in verses 2-5. Though lacking any allusion to the ark, the holy war theme is then resumed with remembrances of a holy war victory tradition of uncertain background but perhaps also deriving from hymnic traditions concerning the victory of Deborah and Barak (vss. 12-15).[1]

---

[1] On this point see chap. 1, §E, and W. Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel: zur Herkunft der Königsprädikation Jahwes* (BZAW, 80; Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1961), pp. 68-69, 78.

[2] On the connection of *š^{e}mô* with the ark and its symbolism see above, chap. 1, §F.

[3] Jud. 5:4-5 reads as follows:

yhwh b^{e}ṣē’t^{e}kā miššē^{c}îr / *b^{e}ṣa^{c}d^{e}kā miśś^{e}dê ’^{e}dôm*
’ereṣ rā^{c}āšâ / *gam-šāmayim nāṭāpû* / *gam-^{c}ābîm nāṭ^{e}pû māyim*
hārîm nāz^{e}lû / *mipp^{e}nê yhwh zeh sînay* / *mipp^{e}nê yhwh ’^{e}lôhê yiśrā’ēl*

Ps. 68:8-9 reads as follows with *yhwh* restored instead of MT *’^{e}lôhîm* and modifications of Jud. 5:4-5 indicated by single quotation marks marking changes of wording and double spaced dots marking omissions:

yhwh b^{e}ṣē’t^{e}kā '*lipnê ^{c}ammekā*' / *b^{e}ṣa^{c}d^{e}kā* '*bîšîmôn*'
’ereṣ rā^{c}āšâ / '*’ap*'-*šamayim nāṭ^{e}pû* . . .
. . . *mipp^{e}nê yhwh zeh sînay* / *mipp^{e}nê yhwh ’^{e}lôhê yiśrā’ēl*

For an attempt to reconstruct a common oral tradition basis for these two theophany texts see Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 7-11, and the discussion above in chap. 1, §E. Cf. Cross, "The Divine Warrior," pp. 25-26.

[4] Cf. Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 4, 126, 148, 161. On the meaning of

The first clear allusion to the Jerusalem cult place occurs in the context of an obscure passage which seems to depict a cultic procession celebrating a holy war victory (vss. 16-19). The identity of *har-bāšān* remains obscure despite varied attempts to explain it (vs. 16; cf. vs. 23).[2] If the synonymous parallel *hār-'^{e}lōhîm* is meant literally rather than as a superlative, then the reference must be to a traditional "mountain of the gods." In any case *har-bāšān*, described in superlative terms, is placed in notable contrast to Yahweh's chosen mountain which, in the context of the psalm as a whole, must be the Yahwistic cult place at Jerusalem (vs. 17).[3] The infinitive *l^{e}šibtô* together with the imperfect *yiškōn* must be taken as references to the ark and cherubim with their throne and theophany symbolism permanently installed either in the

---

naḥ^{a}lâ see §D. Fretheim, *Ark*, pp. 158-164, considers vss. 8-19 as a recitation of the *Heilsgeschichte* climaxing with the transferral of the ark to Zion.

[1] Ps. 68:14a, *'îm-tišk^{e}bûn bên š^{e}pattāyim*, is a somewhat obscure parallel to Jud. 5:16a, *lāmmâ yāšabtā bên hammišp^{e}tayim*, though again differing in meaning as well as wording.

[2] For a brief compilation of several theories see Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 183.

[3] Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 470-471, and *Worship*, p. 168, attempts to identify *har-bāšān* with Tabor and also with the mountain which Yahweh desired as his dwelling place. But this involves a somewhat forced attempt to place *har gabnunnîm* (vs. 16) in contrast with *hārîm gabnunnîm* (vs. 17) rather than to treat them as synonymous. But *har-bāšān* may better be regarded with most translators as the mountain or mountain range which

tent sanctuary of David or in Solomon's temple.[1] The perfect *hāmad* must allude back to the transferral of the ark to Jerusalem by David as a surprising and remarkable divine act.[2]

Verses 18-19, 21-28 provide further fragmentary evidence concerning the cultic background of the psalm despite several textual and exegetical obscurities. Yahweh's ascent of the mountain he has chosen as his dwelling place is probably symbolized by a procession of the ark into the sanctuary. He is portrayed as a victorious king returning from battle accompanied by his chariotry and bringing captives and tribute (vss. 19, 25-26).[3] But at the same time he is pictured as coming from Sinai to enter the sanctuary (vs. 18b).[4] Cosmic mythological imagery of Canaanite background probably lies behind the picture of the chariot myriads accompanying Yahweh in his theophany appearance (vs. 18). This imagery may be clarified by comparison with Deuteronomy 33:2-3 which, along with Judges 5:4-5, preserves a very archaic and vivid picture of Yahweh's theophany

---

which envied the mountain desired by Yahweh.

[1] Note the similarity of these words to the language and thought of the dedicatory poem attributed to Solomon in the story of the installation of the ark in the temple, I Kgs. 8:12-13, discussed in chap. 2, §D, and also the resemblance to Ex. 15:17-18 discussed below, §D.

[2] Though the terminology is different this is essentially the same theme as that expressed more fully in Pss. 132:13-14 and 78:68-69; cf. Fretheim, *Ark*, pp. 160-161.

[3] On this see especially Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, pp. 72-74, and Mowinckel, *Psalms*, I, 172.

[4] Emending the unintelligible combination *’ᵃdônāy bām sînay* to *yhwh bā’ missînay* on the basis of *yhwh missînay bā’* in Deut. 33:2; cf. Hab. 3:3. See Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 10, 155, and Fretheim, *Ark*, pp. 161, 240-241.

appearance from Sinai.[1] In Deuteronomy 33:2 Canaanite storm theophany imagery is implied in the verbs *zāraḥ* and *hôpîa^{c}*, as evident by comparison with Judges 5:4-5. Plausible emendations of the confused text of Deuteronomy 33:2-3 reveal a pantheon of "holy ones" accompanying Yahweh, a picture similar to that implied in the obscure words *rekeb* *’^{e}lôhîm* *ribbôtayim* *’alpê* *šin’ān* of Psalm 68:18.[2] This further illuminates the various theophany titles of Canaanite background applied to Yahweh in Psalm 68 and Deuteronomy 33, *rôkēb* *bā^{ca}rābôt* (Ps. 68:5), *rôkēb* *bišmê* *š^{e}mê-qedem* (68:34), *rôkēb* *šāmayim* (Deut. 33:26).[3] This in turn fits together with the evidence already presented that the cherubim associated with the ark at Shiloh and Jerusalem represent the assimilation of Canaanite storm theophany imagery to the Israelite Sinai theophany tradition.[4]

Other cosmic allusions may be present in the reference to Yahweh's ascent to the height (*ᶜālîtā lammārôm*, vs. 19), and perhaps also in the obscure allusions to Yahweh rescuing from death (*lammāwet tôṣā'ôt*, vs. 21) and bringing back (captives?) from the depths of the sea (*'āšîb mimmᵉṣûlôt yām*, vs. 23).[1] But the picture of an earthly holy war victory celebrated by a triumphal procession of the ark and the Israelite tribal leaders is also clearly evident (vss. 21-28). The processional entry of Yahweh into the sanctuary as king portrayed in verse 25 must surely indicate that the ark leads the triumphal procession as in Psalm 24:7-10.[2] This supports the hypothesis that the earliest Yahwistic cult in Jerusalem focused upon the holy war symbolism and conquest traditions associated with the ark. But at the same time the picture of Yahweh as a god of holy war is enhanced by means of cosmological and mythological themes of Canaanite background. The likelihood that this combination of themes was already associated with the ark at Shiloh has been argued in chapter 1. This probably facilitated the assimilation of local Jebusite mythological traditions, a development which is, however, not as clearly evident in Psalm 68 as in certain other psalms.

---

[1] Cross and Freedman, "The Blessing of Moses," pp. 191-210, present extensive and convincing linguistic and other evidence in support of their view that Deut. 33 was composed in oral form in the eleventh century and put down in writing under David or Solomon. Thus it provides a further example of the kind of hymnic oral tradition material upon which Ps. 68 may have drawn. Cf. Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 8-9, 61-64, 105.

[2] Cross and Freedman, "The Blessing of Moses," pp. 193, 198-200, trying to restore tenth century orthography, emend MT *w^{e}’ātâ* *merib^{e}bôt* *qōdeš* (Deut. 33:2) to *’t-m* (enclitic) *rbbt* *qdšm*, "with him were myriads of holy ones," a reading supported by the Targums, the Vulg. (*et* *cum* *eo* *sanctorum* *millia*) and partially by the LXX (*syn* *myriasin* *kadēs*). They emend MT *kol-q^{e}dôšāyw* *b^{e}yād^{e}kā* (vs. 3) to *kl* *qdšm* *bydk*, "All the holy ones are at Thy hand," following the LXX (*kai* *pantes* *hoi* *hēgiasmenoi* *hypo* *tas* *cheiras* *sou*). Their attempt to emend MT *mîmînô* *’ēs* *dāt* *lāmô* to *mymn* *’šr* *’lm*, "At his right hand proceeded the mighty ones," is speculative but at least slightly plausible. For the use of the term *q^{e}dôšîm* to refer to the semidivine beings who attend Yahweh see especially Ps. 89:6-8. Cf. Cross, "The Divine Warrior," pp. 25-26.

[3] Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 70-71.

[4] See chap. 1, §E, and Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 127-128, 147, 155, 158-159.

Despite textual and interpretative obscurities, the closing section of the psalm (vss. 29-36) shows clearly enough how these themes became the basis of the cultic symbolism of the Jerusalem temple and of the theology of Zion. The holy war power (*ᶜōz*) of Yahweh symbolized by the ark is invoked on behalf of the assembled cultic community and emanates from the temple out over Jerusalem, *mēhêkāl^{e}kā* *^{c}al-y^{e}rûšālēm* (vss. 29-30a).[1] This probably implies a theophany manifestation of the sort depicted in verses 34-36. Here again occurs Canaanite storm-god theophany imagery in a line that could easily derive from a Canaanite Baal hymn. The allusion to thunder (*hēn* *yittēn* *b^{e}qôlô* *qôl* *^{c}ōz*, vs. 34b) calls to mind the Canaanite storm theophany of Psalm 29:3-9. But a play on the word *^{c}ōz* here and in the following verses seems to connect this imagery with the ark as the symbol of holy war.[2] The cultic community is called upon to ascribe *^{c}ōz*

---

[1] So Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 474-476; cf. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 184-185.

[2] Cf. Davies, "The Ark in the Psalms," pp. 56-57, Schmid, "Kulttraditionen," p. 194, Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, p. 74, and Mowinckel, *Psalms*, I, 11, 172. See also Fretheim, *Ark*, p. 162.

---

[1] The confused text of this verse has been construed variously. The simplest and most common reconstruction is that presupposed by Weiser, *Psalms*, p. 479:

ṣawwēh *'^{e}lôheykā* *^{c}uzzekā* *^{c}ōz* *hā'^{e}lôhîm* *zû* *pā^{c}altā* *lānû*

"Summon thy might, O God;
the might of God which thou hast prepared for us."

The reading *ṣawwēh* *'^{e}lôhîm* is supported by many mss. MT as well as the versions (cf. *BH*). Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 466-467, further emends *'^{e}lôhîm* to *yhwh* but apparently regards *lānû* as unintelligible. A somewhat different reconstruction is offered by Johnson, *Sacral* *Kingship*, p. 75:

ṣawwēh *'^{e}lôhay* *k^{e}^{c}uzz^{e}kā* *^{c}ōz* *hā'^{e}lôhîm* *zû* *pā^{c}altā* *lānû*

"Issue thy commands, O my God, as befitteth Thy might,
The divine might which Thou has [sic] exercised for us!"

Still another possible reconstruction could be offered:

ṣawwēh *yhwh* *^{c}ōz* *k^{e}^{c}ōz* *hā'^{e}lôhîm* *zû* *pā^{c}altā* *lānû*

"O Yahweh command might,
like the might of the gods,
which you have exercised for us."

The general significance of the verse is fairly clear in any case. Vs. 30a is most intelligible when construed as a continuation of the thought of vs. 29. The connection with vs. 30b is so unclear that Weiser, p. 479, moves 30b to the beginning of vs. 32 to give it a more appropriate context. Johnson, p. 75, emends *mēhêkālekā* to *mah-y^{e}kolkā* (infinitive construct) and translates vs. 30a "How potent thou art on behalf of Jerusalem," rejecting Albright's more smooth emendation *mah-yakōltā* (perfect of *ykl*). But there is not sufficient reason for such emendations if the text as it stands can yield an intelligible meaning.

[2] Cf. Davies, "The Ark in the Psalms," p. 58.

to Yahweh. But this is again pictured as a heavenly theophany-like manifestation "over Israel," *^{c}āl-yiśrā’ēl ga’^{a}wātô / w^{ec}uzzô bašš^{e}ḥāqîm* (vs. 35), just as verses 29-30a pictured Yahweh's *^{c}ōz* as issuing forth from the temple over Jerusalem. Yahweh is called *rôkēb bišmê š^{e}mê qedem* (vs. 34a), a title which resembles the demonstrably Canaanite title *rôkēb bā^{ca}rābôt* in verse 5 and *rôkēb šāmayim* in Deuteronomy 33:26, both of which occur in close association with allusions to the conquest of Canaan as a holy war victory.[1] But verse 36 ties this theophany imagery to the temple as the source out of which Yahweh's holy war power emanates when it is bestowed upon Israel, *nôrā’ yhwh mimmiqdāšô / ’ēl yiśrā’ēl hû’ / nôtēn ^{c}ōz w^{e}ta^{ca}ṣûmôt l^{ec}ammô*.[2] Thus verses 34-36 present in hymnic participle style embellished with theophany imagery, essentially the same picture as the invocation in verses 29-30a. The ark in the Jerusalem temple is the symbolic focal point of Yahweh's holy war power which is pictured as a theophany emanating from the temple to manifest itself on behalf of Israel.

The intervening material in verses 30b-33 is not separable on formal grounds from verses 29-30a and 34-36, though its meaning is more obscure. It probably picks up again the picture introduced in verses 18-19 of a cultic procession of the ark toward the temple. The kings and nations of the earth are represented as bringing tribute and offerings to Yahweh.[3]

---

[1] Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 70, 88, 148, 162.

[2] Restoring *yhwh* for *’^{e}lôhîm* and reading *mimmiqdāšô* for *mimmiqdāšeykā* with Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 466-467 (cf. *BH* and versions), and reading *l^{ec}ammô* for *lā^{c}ām* with the LXX (cf. *BH*).

[3] For two textual reconstructions of vss. 30b-33 which yield essentially similar meanings see Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 466-467, and Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, pp. 75-76.

This became a traditional element in the cultic imagery of Zion as indicated by the recurrence of the formula *l^{e}kā yôbîlû m^{e}lākîm šāy* (vs. 30b) in somewhat varying forms in Psalm 76:12 and Isaiah 18:7.[1] Earlier portions of the psalm reflect hymnic and cultic imagery deriving from premonarchic holy war traditions transformed hymnically and cultically into sacred legends. Similarly this picture of kings bringing tribute to Yahweh at Jerusalem must be taken as a stylized hymnic and cultic celebration of the real imperial power and inflow of wealth characteristic of Jerusalem during the united monarchy. Thus the traditional holy war symbolism of the ark and the associated cosmic and theophany imagery formed the basis for the religious interpretation of the power and splendor of the empire of David and Solomon centering politically in Jerusalem and cultically in the temple as the sanctuary of the ark. This is the primary basis for the developing significance of Zion as a theological symbol.

B. Genesis 14:17-24 and the Canaanite Elyon Tradition

On the whole, the Canaanite elements in Psalm 68 seem to reflect themes assimilated to the ark and cherubim cult in the premonarchic period and then transplanted, along with the ark, from Shiloh to Jerusalem and adapted to the cult sponsored by David and Solomon.[2] For evidence of the assimilation of Jebusite cultic traditions into the cultic establishment of David and Solomon we may first look at Genesis 14:17-24 and its references to the cult of El Elyon at Salem (*šālēm*), which clearly means

---

[1] Cf. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 185-186.

[2] Cf. Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes*, pp. 76-79.

Jerusalem as in Psalm 76:3.[1] These verses appear to be integrated only loosely into the context of Genesis 14, even though they constitute the theological climax of the chapter ascribing Abraham's victory to El Elyon and portraying the blessing pronounced upon him by Melchizedek, king of Salem and priest of El Elyon.[2] The passage clearly identifies El Elyon as an important deity worshipped in pre-Israelite Jerusalem.[3] In the double name, El Elyon, *’ēl* appears to be the primary name of the god which is on the way to becoming a generic term, whereas *^{c}elyôn* appears to be a title which is on the way to becoming his real name.[4] The title

---

[1] Only a few serious attempts to deny the original connection of Salem and the Melchizedek story with Jerusalem have been made. H. W. Hertzberg, "Die Melchisedek-Traditionen" (1928), *Beiträge zur Traditionsgeschichte und Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), pp. 36-44, attempted to connect Gen. 14:17-24 with Mt. Tabor mainly on the basis of medieval pilgrim traditions. The Genesis Apocryphon (IQapGn) 22:13 identifies Salem explicitly as Jerusalem (*hy’ yrwšlm*), cf. J. A. Fitzinger, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1: A Commentary* (Biblica et Orientalia, 18; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966), pp. 153-154.

[2] The way in which this tradition has been integrated into the context may be indicated by the explanatory phrase *hû’ ^{c}ēmeq hammelek* which is attached to *^{c}ēmeq šāwēh* (vs. 17b) in order to make clear the connection with *melek šālēm* (vs. 18a). Cf. G. A. Barrois, "Shaveh, Valley of," *IDB*, IV, 310, who regards the phrase as a gloss.

[3] Clues to other pre-Davidic deities of Jebusite Jerusalem or to other names and titles for El Elyon are sometimes detected in various proper names. Most frequently suggested is the element *šlm* of the place name *šālēm/y^{e}rûšālēm* and the personal names *š^{e}lōmôh* and *’abšālôm* of two of David's sons. Also suggested is the element *ṣdq* (or alternatively the elements *mlk* and *’dn*) of the personal names *malkîṣedeq* and *’^{a}dônî-sedeq* (Josh. 10:1,3; cf. *’^{a}donî-bezeq*, Jud. 1:5-7) ascribed to pre-Davidic kings of Jerusalem and in the name of David's priest *ṣādôq*. That these were frequently occurring names and titles for west Semitic deities is well substantiated. But this provides little specific evidence concerning Jebusite cults which might have influenced the cultic establishments of David and Solomon. For the evidence see Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, pp. 31-46, Porteous, "Jerusalem-Zion," pp. 239-249, and sources cited by Schmid, "Kulttraditionen," pp. 176-177, and Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 42-43.

[4] Cf. Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," pp. 241-244. In Num. 24:16 which occurs in a J passage that may plausibly be dated to the early period of the monarchy, *’ēl*, *^{c}elyôn* and *šadday* are placed in

qônēh *šāmayim* *wā'āreṣ* identifies this god as a creator god.[1] This invites comparisons with the functions of El and Elyon in Canaanite texts.

In the Ugaritic texts the god *il* is depicted as creator, in some cases perhaps using the verb *qny*, cognate with Hebrew *qnh*, meaning "create, produce."[2] Though less active than *b^{c}l*, he is the patriarchal head of the Ugaritic pantheon to whom the other gods bring their reports and demands.[3] He is called *mlk* and is attended by a divine assembly or royal court.[4] The traditional picture of El as creator is also reflected

---

synonymous parallelism as equivalent titles for the same deity who in context is Yahweh. Cf. Weiser, *The Old Testament*, pp. 104-105.

[1] G. Levi Della Vida, "El 'Elyon in Genesis 14:18-20," *JBL*, LXIII (1944), 1-9, argued somewhat implausibly that El Elyon was a speculative theological combination of El the Lord of Earth with Elyon the Lord of Heaven. R. Rendtorff, "El, Ba^{c}al und Jahwe," *ZAW*, LXXVIII (1966), 277-291, has suggested somewhat more plausibly that El Elyon represents a merging of El as creator of the earth with Baal called Elyon as god of heaven.

[2] Schmid, "Kulttraditionen," p. 178, cites *UM*, I *Aqht* 219-220 and 76:III:6-7, both somewhat fragmentary passages. In the first passage the subject *il* can probably be restored, but is conjectural in the second; cf. *ANET*, pp. 142b, 155b. The same verb apparently refers to *krt* begetting children, *UM*, *Krt*:57; cf. *ANET*, p. 143b. As a participle it occurs in the title *qnyt* *ilm* in stereotyped synonymous parallelism with *rbt* *aṯrt* *ym* referring to *aṯrt* as "progenitress" or "creatress" of the gods, *UM*, 51:I:23, III:26,30,35, IV:32; cf. *ANET*, pp. 132a-133a. A somewhat similar participial title *bny* *bnwt* occurs in similar stereotyped synonymous parallelism with *ltpn* *il* *dpid* or *ṯr* *il* *dpid* referring to the god *il* as "creator of creatures," *UM*, 49:III:5,11 and 51:II:11, III:32, 2 *Aqht*:I:25; cf. *ANET*, pp. 140b, 132, 150a. On this whole point see W. Schmidt, *Königtum* *Gottes*, pp. 49-52. For a recent summary discussion of *il* in the Ugaritic texts see A. S. Kapelrud, *The* *Ras* *Shamra* *Discoveries* *and* *the* *Old* *Testament*, tr. G. W. Anderson (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), pp. 56-59.

[3] For example in the Baal and Anat cycle the gods seek his authorization for palaces to be built for themselves. In the *Krt* and *Aqht* texts the appeals of *krt* and *dnil* for sons are brought to *il*.

[4] In *UM*, 51:IV:47-48 and *^{c}nt*:vi:IV:43-44, *[i]l* *mlk* *dyknnh* is the synonymous parallel of *ṯr* *il* *abh*. In 49:I:8, 51:IV:24, and 2 *Aqht*:VI:49 he is called *mlk* *ab* *šnm*. Note also the name *ilmlk*, 62:53, 127:59, 151:9, 308:24. References to *dr* *bn* *il* occur in 2:17, 25-26, 34, twice paralleled by *mpḫrt* *bn* *il*. In 128:III:18-19 (a *Krt* text) *dr* *il* parallels *ilm*, cf. 1:7 *dr* *il* *wp[ḫ]r* *b^{c}l* and 107:2-3 *dr* *b(t/n)* *il* *mpḫrt* *bn* *il*. In

in two occurrences in later Phoenician sources of the title *’l qn ’rṣ*, closely resembling the title in Genesis 14:19.[1] The Old Testament and Canaanite occurrences of the verb *qnh* in the sense of "create" are in contexts in which hymnic and mythological or at least cosmogonic overtones are apparent.[2] The name *’l* alone occurs twice in Aramaic texts from north Syria in a position second to *hdd* in series with several other deities but with no expressed mythological context.[3] In the Aramaic treaty inscription between *Ktk* and Arpad the combination *’l w^{c}lyn* occurs in a curse formula invoking a long list of deities.[4] It is plausible to regard this as a double name for a single deity though two deities may

---

137:30-31 *lp^{c}n il [l]tpl* is in synonymous parallelism with *ltšḥwy pḫr m^{c}d*. Cf. Schmid, "Kulttraditionen," p. 179, and Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes*, pp. 5-7, 18-21, 54-56.

[1] In the eighth century B.C. Karatepe inscription it occurs after *b^{c}l šmm*, and along with *šmš ^{c}lm* and *kl dr bn ’lm* in a curse invocation, *KAI*, 26:A:III:18. The main god in this text is clearly *b^{c}l*. A second century A.D. plaque from Leptis is dedicated *l’dn l’l qn ’rṣ*, *KAI*, 129:1. For possible reflections of this title in non-Canaanite sources see *KAI*, commentary on 26:A:III:18.

[2] P. Humbert, "'Qânâ' en Hébreu biblique," *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. W. Baumgartner et al. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1950), pp. 265-266, lists six occurrences of the verb *qnh* as clearly meaning "create": Gen. 14:19,22; Deut. 32:6; Pss. 78:54(?); 139:13; and Prov. 8:22. For the cognate Ugaritic verb *qny* he cites the passages published in *UM* as *Krt*:57, 2 *Aqht*:VI:41, 51:I:23, III:26,30,35. He argues that Hebrew *qnh* meaning "create" is from an entirely different root than *qnh* meaning "acquire, purchase" and that there is no connection between the two meanings. He maintains further that *qnh* meaning "create" in the Old Testament is a relic of pre-Israelite Canaanite cultic and mythological language whereas *br’* belonged to a specifically Yahwistic cosmogonic myth in the liturgy of pre-exilic Israel.

[3] The two Panammuwa inscriptions from near Zendjirli, eighth century B.C., list the gods *hdd*, *’l*, *rkb’l*, *ršp* and *šmš* several times in more or less fixed order, *KAI*, 214:2,11,18, 215:22. In the first text the king attributes his royal power to them and in the second they are apparently invoked in a blessing or curse formula.

[4] *KAI*, 222:A:11; cf. *ANET*, p. 504.

be meant.[1] Eusebius of Pamphylia in his work *Praeparatio Evangelica* cites Philo Byblios as alluding to a Phoenician myth concerning *el elioun kaloumenos hypsistos* who is represented mythologically as begetting heaven and earth.[2] On the basis of the Ugaritic title *ṯr il* and the warlike character of *kronos* = El in Philo's account, Miller has argued that El is one source of the Israelite picture of Yahweh as a warrior.[3]

Together these scattered bits of evidence show that the ancient Canaanite and Syrian god *ʼl* was traditionally regarded in mythological terms as creator of heaven and earth and as king over the pantheon. It also indicates that the title *^{c}lyn*, perhaps referring to his headship of the pantheon, was associated especially with *ʼl*, even when some other god such as *b^{c}l/hdd* superseded him as the predominant deity.[4] Genesis 14: 17-24 indicates that these Canaanite El Elyon traditions probably influenced Israelite tradition primarily through a Jebusite El Elyon cult at Jerusalem which was in some way associated with Melchizedek as a royal and priestly figure.

C. The Assimilation of Elyon Themes in Psalm 82 and Deuteronomy 32

Allusions to the Canaanite pantheon are especially clear in Psalm 82, where the terms *^{ca}dat-ʼēl* (vs. 1) and *b^{e}nê ^{c}elyôn* (vs. 6) are each in synonymous parallelism with *’ᵉlôhîm* which has here a plural meaning. El = Elyon is not identified explicitly with Yahweh in this passage.[1] Nevertheless, Yahweh is depicted as exercising supreme authority over the gods. But, in contrast to El in Ugaritic mythology, he pronounces a judgment against them which nullifies their divine status because they have shown their incompetence to rule justly and have thereby threatened the earth with chaos.[2] Instead Yahweh himself takes over the authority he had delegated to them.[3] Kraus, who calls this psalm "perhaps very old," regards it as an oracle spoken by an authoritative Moses-like prophetic mediator who has been granted admission to the divine council.[4] The evidence that such a cultic official was associated with the ark at Shiloh has been discussed in connection with Samuel at Shiloh in I Samuel 3.[5] Interestingly enough, the words *qûmâ yhwh* in the closing appeal to

---

[1] In the Ugaritic texts a double name connected by the copula *w* often denotes a single deity, especially the god *kṯr wḫss*. Cf. Schmid, "Kulttraditionen," pp. 179-180, and de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, p. 310. Clements, *God and Temple*, p. 47, insists on the other hand that two gods are meant and that *^{c}lyn* here probably refers to *b^{c}l*.

[2] Cited by Schmid, "Kulttraditionen," p. 179. See the quotation and discussion of this and other related material by J. Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis* (ICC; 2d ed., Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1930), pp. 48-50, 124, 270.

[3] P. D. Miller Jr., "El the Warrior," *Harvard Theological Review*, LX (1967), 411-431.

[4] On *^{c}lyn* as a title designating *ʼl* as head of the pantheon see Clements, *God and Temple*, p. 45, and Eichrodt, *Theology*, I, 181.

---

[1] In vss. 1a and 8a *’ᵉlôhîm* can probably be emended to *yhwh* as often in the Elohistic section of the psalms.

[2] Cf. Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes*, pp. 32-34. Somewhat similar is Ps. 58:2-3 if one reads *’ēlîm* instead of *’ēlem* in vs. 2 with *BH*.

[3] Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 573, thinks there may be an echo here of the mythological theme of the supreme deity El or Elyon casting down a rival god who attempts to usurp his authority as in Is. 14:12-15 and Ezek. 28:12-16. O. Eissfeldt, "El und Jahwe" (1956), *KS*, III, 390, argues that Yahweh is here pictured as a member of El's divine council who functions as the accuser bringing charges against the other gods and that he is therefore represented as subordinate to El, the head of the pantheon; similarly Schmid, "Kulttraditionen," pp. 183-184. But in fact the psalm pictures Yahweh not only as accuser but as the supreme judge who both bestows and takes away the authority of the gods. Thus Yahweh assumes all the functions of El whether or not he is formally identified with El. Cf. Weiser, *Psalms*, p. 558, note.

[4] Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 570, who cites his own study, *Die prophetische Verkündigung des Rechts in Israel*, and E. Würthwein, "Der Ursprung der prophetischen Gerichtsrede," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, XLIX (1952), 1-15. Cf. Num. 12:6-8 and Deut. 18:15-22 (Moses); I Kgs. 22:19-23 (Micaiah); Is. 6; Jer. 23:18; and Kraus, *Worship*, pp. 105-112.

[5] See chap. 1, §C.

Yahweh to take up his universal dominion over the nations of the earth make Psalm 82:8 sound like another variation of the ark chants of Numbers 10:35; Psalms 68:2; 132:8 = II Chronicles 6:41.[1] One may infer that this invocation, spoken probably by the prophet himself, is addressed to Yahweh in the presence of the ark just as the chant of Numbers 10:35 ascribed to Moses invokes his victorious intervention in holy war. Thus this psalm reflects the partial assimilation of the ancient holy war traditions associated with Yahweh and the ark to the Canaanite picture of El Elyon as head of the pantheon. In this way Yahweh's victorious intervention symbolized by the ark is depicted in vaguely cosmic and mythological terms, giving it a more abstract and universal scope and significance in comparison with the concreteness and particularity of the older holy war stories.

In Deuteronomy 32, probably a relatively early composition, Elyon is again clearly depicted as the head of the pantheon, here designated by the term *bᵉnê ʼēl* (vss. 8-9).[2] As such he has assigned each particular nation to the care of one particular deity:

---

[1] Cf. Davies, "Ark of the Covenant," p. 225b, and "The Ark in the Psalms," p. 60, and the discussion in chap. 1, §A, chap. 4, §A, and chap. 5, §A.

[2] In a marked shift from older attempts to treat Deut. 32 as post-exilic a premonarchic date has been argued by W. F. Albright, "Some Remarks on the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy xxxii," *VT*, IX (1959), 339-346, and O. Eissfeldt, *Das Lied Moses Deuteronomium xxxii, 1-43, und das Lehrgedicht Asophs Psalm 78 samt einen Analyse den Umgebung des Mose-Liedes* (Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Sachs. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Phil.-histor, Klasse, 104/5, Berlin, 1958), as cited by Beyerlin, *Sinaitic Traditions*, pp. 70, 76. Eissfeldt argues that it was later incorporated into the E strand; cf. "Die Umrahmung des Mose-Liedes Dtn 32, 1-43 und des Mose-Gesetzes Dtn 1-30 in Dtn 31, 9-32, 47" (1954-55), *KS*, III, 322-334, and *Introduction*, pp. 226-227. This is accepted by Weiser, *The Old Testament*, pp. 118-119. However it seems necessary to regard the chapter as partially dependent on the Jerusalem Elyon tradition and thus monarchic rather than premonarchic; cf. G. H. Davies, "Deuteronomy," *PCB*, §243. In a recent full treatment of this psalm,

b^{e}hanḥēl *^{c}elyôn* *gôyîm* / *b^{e}haprîdô* *b^{e}nê* *’ādām*
yaṣṣēb *g^{e}bûlôt* *^{c}ammîm* / *l^{e}mispar* *b^{e}nê* *’ēl* (vs. 8)[1]

Verses 8-9 by themselves might indicate that Yahweh is one of the members of the pantheon subordinate to Elyon and that Israel is the nation allocated to his special care:

kî *ḥēleq* *yhwh* *^{c}ammô* / *ya^{ca}qôb* *ḥebel* *naḥ^{a}lātô* (vs. 9)[2]

However, the larger context shows that this mythological picture is intended to depict Yahweh's election of Israel. But it does so by picturing him in the role of El Elyon who, as creator, set Israel apart for himself from the beginning:

h^{a}lô’-hû’ *’ābîkā* *qānekā* / *hû’* *^{c}āś^{e}kā* *way^{e}kôn^{e}nekā* (vs. 6b)[3]

This use of a fragment of Elyon mythology has the effect of placing the

---

G. E. Wright, "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, pp. 36-40, 58-67, inclines toward a date in the ninth century or a little later.

[1] Reading *b^{e}nê* *’ēl* rather than *b^{e}nê* *yiśrā’ēl* of the MT on the basis of the LXX and Qumran ms. 4Q Deut. 32, first published by P. W. Skehan, "A Fragment of the 'Song of Moses' (Deuteronomy 32) from Qumrân," *BASOR*, No. 136 (1954), pp. 12-15. This reading is generally accepted; cf. Eissfeldt, "El und Jahwe," p. 389 note, and Wright, "The Lawsuit of God," pp. 41-49. The contention of W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (2d ed., Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1957), pp. 296-297, that the term simply refers to the stars is not convincing; cf. Ps. 89:6-8. Even if the stars are meant, this still represents the idea of a pantheon of astral deities.

[2] Eissfeldt, "El und Jahwe," p. 390, argues that in this passage Yahweh is clearly distinct from and subordinate to Elyon. Cf. Ringgren, *Israelite Religion*, pp. 44, 72. On the Canaanite background of the term *naḥ^{a}lâ* see the discussion of Ex. 15:17 below, §D.

[3] So Wright, "Deuteronomy," pp. 519-520, and "The Lawsuit of God," p. 35. Cf. von Rad, *Theology*, I, 142.

traditional faith in Yahweh's election of Israel in a universal and cosmic setting as the preface to hymnic recollections of the *heilsgeschichtlich* traditions concerning his care for Israel in the desert and in Canaan (vss. 10-14).

D. Elyon Themes and the Holy War Symbolism of the Ark in Exodus 15:1b-18

Another psalm not far removed from the period of united monarchy shows traces of the influence of Elyon mythology assimilated to the holy war symbolism of the ark, while at the same time supporting the interpretation of Psalm 68 given above. This is the variously named Song of Moses, Song of Miriam, or "Schilfmeerlied," preserved in Exodus 15:1b-18.[1] This hymn celebrates the victorious power of Yahweh in a hymnic recital of his deliverance of Israel at the Sea of Reeds (vss. 1b-10), his defeat of Israel's enemies as he led them into the holy land (vss. 13-16) and, as the climax, his establishment of the Jerusalem sanctuary as the place of his eternal reign (vss. 17-18). Holy war themes and imagery permeate the entire hymn. Yahweh is portrayed as a mighty warrior hero (*'îš milḥāmâ*, vs. 3; cf. vs. 5), who used the sea as his weapon against Pharaoh's chariotry (vss. 1b,4-5,7-10).[1] His terror overwhelmed Philistia, Edom, Moab, and all the inhabitants of Canaan as he led Israel to Canaan (vss. 13-16). This picture of the terror of Yahweh overwhelming the enemy resembles the "numinous panic" from Yahweh that overcomes the enemy in certain holy war stories such as the story of Jonathan's victory over the Philistines in the so-called "Early Source," I Samuel 14:1-23.[2]

---

[1] The date of this poem has been much disputed. For compilations of various scholarly viewpoints see F. M. Cross Jr. and D. N. Freedman, "The Song of Miriam," *JNES*, XIV (1955), 237-240, and D. M. G. Stalker, "Exodus," *PCB*, §187g. W. F. Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine* (rev. ed., Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1960), p. 233, emphasizes the stylistic similarities to the Song of Deborah and argues for a date in the thirteenth century. But his contention that vs. 17 does not refer to the sanctuary at Jerusalem is unconvincing. Cross and Freedman, p. 240, who are much influenced by Albright, date its oral composition to the twelfth century but concede that the written form of the poem may be as late as the tenth century. Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 52-55, is on firmer ground in dating it along with Ps. 68 to the time of David and Solomon. As in the case of Ps. 68, however, it is quite plausible to suppose that Ex. 15:1b-18 may be partially dependent upon hymnic and holy war poetry preserved in oral tradition form from the premonarchic period and brought to Jerusalem in connection with David's establishment of the ark cult. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 209, uses the similarities between Ex. 15:14-15 and Ps. 48:6-7 as evidence that the Exodus hymn has been influenced by the tradition of a "Völkersturm auf die Heilige Stadt" and that it must therefore be dated relatively late in the monarchic period. But one may better argue on the basis of the many archaic features of Ex. 15:1b-18 pointed out by Cross and Freedman that language and style of the type which it represents have influenced the "Völkersturm" tradition of Ps. 48; cf. Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes*, pp. 65-66.

Canaanite storm-god imagery may be present in the picture of Yahweh's breath agitating the sea (vss. 8,10). The rhetorical questions picturing Yahweh as the greatest among the gods presuppose the Canaanite-style mythological picture of Yahweh as head of a pantheon, *mî-kāmôkâ*

---

[1] Cf. J. Muilenburg, "A Liturgy of the Triumphs of Yahweh," *Studia Biblica et Semitica Theodoro Christiano Vriezen Dedicata*, ed. W. C. van Unnik and A. S. van der Woude (Wageningen: H. Veenman & Zonen, 1966), pp. 234-235, 239-240.

[2] In I Sam. 14:1-23 note especially the words *ḥ^{a}rādâ*, *ḥar^{e}dû*, *ḥerdat '^{e}lôhîm*, *wattirgaz hā'āreṣ*, vs. 15, *nāmôg*, vs. 16, and *m^{e}hûmâ g^{e}dôlâ m^{e}'ōd*, vs. 20. In Ex. 15 note the words *ḥîl 'āḥaz* (vs. 14), *yō'ḥ^{a}zemô rā^{c}ad* and *nāmôgû* (vs. 15) and especially *tippōl ^{c}alêhem 'êmātâ wāpaḥad* (vs. 16). Cf. the many passages cited by von Rad, *Heilige Krieg*, pp. 10-13, on this aspect of the traditional picture of holy war in Israel. He regards I Sam. 14 as an unusually authentic and revealing account of holy war as conceived and conducted in the time of Saul, p. 21. See also von Rad, *Theology*, II, 123-124.

bā'ēlîm *yhwh* / *mî* *kāmôkā* *ne'dār* *baqq^{e}dôšîm* (vs. 11).[1] But this kind of language is adopted here to glorify Yahweh as the victorious god of Israel's holy war traditions, as shown by the concluding line of the same verse, *nôrā'* *t^{e}hillôt* / *^{c}ôśēh* *p^{e}le'*. The basic thought of the psalm moves almost entirely within the framework of Israel's *heilsgeschichtlich* and holy war traditions.[2] Israel's entire sacred history, depicted in a stylized and schematic way as a series of divinely wrought holy war victories, has as its double goal the establishment of Israel in the holy land and the establishment of Yahweh's dwelling place in the Jerusalem sanctuary (vss. 13,17). In this respect it resembles Psalms 68 and 78.

The holy land has its focal point in Jerusalem as the place of the sanctuary. The words *t^{e}bî'ēmô* *w^{e}tiṭṭā^{c}ēmô* *b^{e}har* *naḥ^{a}lāt^{e}kā* (vs. 17a) view David's conquest of Jerusalem as the climactic event epitomizing the significance of the entire conquest of Canaan. The probable mythological background of the term *har* *naḥ^{a}lāt^{e}kā* is indicated by the use of the word *nḥlt* in the Ugaritic Baal and Anat cycle to refer to a god's mountain or territory which is at the same time his dwelling place or sanctuary or the place of his throne.[3] The Canaanite mythological significance of the term is further clarified by the use of the verb *nḥl* hiphil and the noun *naḥ^{a}lâ* in Deuteronomy 32:8-9, reflecting the traditional picture of the high god Elyon allocating a sphere of authority to each member of the pantheon. Thus *naḥ^{a}lâ* can refer either to the mountain or sanctuary of a god or to the territory or people ruled by the god.[1] In Deuteronomy 32 it refers to Israel as Yahweh's *naḥ^{a}lâ* because he created them and brought them into Canaan. Exodus 15 also refers to Yahweh creating Israel as his people.[2] But Jerusalem is his *naḥ^{a}lâ*, both as the goal toward which he has led his people and as the place where he has established his sanctuary.[3]

---

[1] Reading *baqq^{e}dôšîm* as a synonymous parallel of *bā'ēlîm* with the LXX and Syrohexaplar in place of MT *baqqōdeš*; cf. Cross and Freedman, "The Song of Miriam," p. 247, Muilenburg, "A Liturgy of the Triumphs of Yahweh," p. 244, and *BH*. Cf. Ps. 82:1,6 and Deut. 32:8-9.

[2] On the *heilsgeschichtlich* framework of Ex. 15:1b-18 see von Rad, *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch*, p. 18, and Schmid, "Kulttraditionen," pp. 168-171.

[3] In the five occurrences of the noun *nḥlt* in the Ugaritic texts the word is used to refer to the dwelling places of three different gods. In *UM*, *^{c}nt*:III:26-28, which is partially paralleled in *^{c}nt*:IV:63-64, it occurs in one of a series of five terms and honorific expressions in synonymous parallelism referring to Zaphon as Baal's mountain, *btk* *ǵry*

---

il ṣpn / *bqdš* / *bǵr nḥlty* / *bn^{c}m* / *bgb^{c} tliyt*. In two other nearly identical passages, *UM*, 51:VIII:11-14, and 67:II:15-16, it occurs in one of a series of expressions in synonymous parallelism referring to the underworld land of Mot, *tk qrth hmry* / *mk ksu ṯbth* / *ḫḫ arṣ nḥlth* (text 67 reads *ṯbty* and lacks *ḫḫ*). In still another context, *UM*, *^{c}nt*:VI:14-16, it is one of a series of expressions referring to the dwelling place of the craftsman god *kṯr wḫss* on Caphtor, *kptr ksu ṯbth* / *ḥkpt arṣ nḥlth*. For discussions of the relationship of these passages to Ex. 15:17 see Cross and Freedman, "The Song of Miriam," pp. 240, 249-250, Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 209-210, and Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 52-53.

[1] In discussing *naḥ^{a}lâ* in Ex. 15:17 and its Ugaritic cognate, Clements, *God and Temple*, p. 53, says: "The purport of such a description of the divine abodes was to designate the gods as owners of the land where their worshippers lived, and which formed the divine 'inheritance'. Thus the sanctuaries were symbolic of the divine ownership of the land."

[2] Compare for example the similar expressions *^{c}am-zû qānîtā*, Ex. 15:16, and *h^{a}lô'-hû' 'abîkā qānekā*, Deut. 32:6.

[3] Whether the words *har naḥ^{a}lāt^{e}kā* in Ex. 15:17 refer to Canaan as a whole or specifically to Jerusalem has been much debated. Cross and Freedman, "The Song of Miriam," pp. 240, 250, argue on the basis of the Ugaritic passages referred to above that it refers to the land of Canaan rather than to Jerusalem. The context is such that neither idea can be entirely excluded. The best solution is to assume on the basis of the context that both ideas are present but that Zion stands in the foreground of thought. Cf. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 209-210, and Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 52-54, who argue that Yahweh's choice of Zion implies that the entire land of Canaan belongs to him. This helps

Exodus 15:17-18 alludes even more clearly to the installation of the ark in the sanctuary at Jerusalem. This, together with David's conquest of Jerusalem, constitutes one single climactic event. The words *mākôn* *l^{e}šibt^{e}kā* *pā^{c}altā* *yhwh* / *miqdāš* *yhwh* *kôn^{e}nû* *yādeykā* (vs. 17) and *yhwh* *yimlōk* *l^{ec}ôlām* *wā^{c}ed* (vs. 18) clearly resemble the second half of the dedicatory poem attributed to Solomon in the account of the installation of the ark in the temple, *bānôh* *bānîtî* *bêt* *z^{e}bul* *lāk* / *mākôn* *l^{e}šibt^{e}kā* *^{c}ôlāmîm* (I Kgs. 8:13).[1] They likewise resemble the language and thought of Psalm 68:17, *hāhār* *hāmad* *yhwh* *l^{e}šibtô* / *ʾap-yhwh* *yiškōn* *lāneṣaḥ*, which must also refer to the installation of the ark on Mt. Zion. This provides a plausible basis for regarding the words *nēhaltā* *b^{ec}ozz^{e}kā* *ʾel-n^{e}wēh* *qodš^{e}kā* in Exodus 15:13b as another allusion to the ark and its sanctuary at Zion.[2] The term *n^{e}wēh* *qodš^{e}kā*, like *har* *naḥ^{a}lāt^{e}kā* in verse 17, points to the sanctuary at Jerusalem as the focal point of the land of Canaan and the *heilsgeschichtlich* goal of Yahweh's holy war triumphs.[3] Thus, as in the Yahwistic stratum and Psalm 68, the

---

to explain why Yahweh's *naḥ^{a}lâ* is mentioned in various passages with such a range of different yet interrelated references. In Ps. 79:1 it clearly refers to the temple. In contrast it refers to the land of Canaan in Ps. 68:10. In Ps. 2:8 it refers to the nations of the world as the divinely granted *naḥ^{a}lâ* of the Davidic king. In most other passages it refers to Israel as Yahweh's people, as for example in I Sam. 10:1; I Kgs. 8:51,53; Pss. 33:12; 78:62,71; 94:5,14; 106:5,40, and elsewhere; cf. *BDB*, definition 1.e.

[1] Cf. Muilenburg, "A Liturgy on the Triumphs of Yahweh," pp. 249-250.

[2] On *^{c}ōz* as a holy war term associated with the ark see chap. 1, §C, and the repeated occurrences of the term in Ps. 68:29-36 discussed above, §A.

[3] That *n^{e}wēh* *qodšekā* can refer to the place of the ark in Jerusalem is indicated especially by II Sam. 15:25 where *nāwēhû* clearly has that

ark is the symbol of Yahweh's holy war power by which he led Israel into the promised land and established his sanctuary at Zion.[1] At the same time its permanent installation in the Jerusalem sanctuary as a throne symbol represents Yahweh's kingship enduring forever. Thus the ark in the Jerusalem temple is the focal point for both the ancient holy war and heilsgeschichtlich traditions of Israel and for the Canaanite mythological picture of the high god as king.[2]

E. Elyon Themes and the Ark in the Psalms of Yahweh's Kingship: Psalms 97 and 47

Further evidence of the assimilation of Jebusite Elyon themes occurs in the psalms of Yahweh's kingship (Pss. 47, 93, 96, 97, 98, 99).[3] The date and cultic significance of this group of psalms has been a hotly disputed issue in the field of Old Testament scholarship. A pre-exilic date is more and more widely accepted, however, and is supported by the prominence of Canaanite imagery.[4] The cultic setting of these psalms is

---

meaning. On the meaning of nāweh in Ex. 15:13 see Schreiner, Sion-Jerusalem, p. 210, and Cross and Freedman, "The Song of Miriam," p. 248. The term nāweh has somewhat the same ambiguity in usage as $\text{nāḥ}^{a}\text{lâ}$ discussed above. In Ps. 79:7 and Jer. 10:25; 50:19 it apparently refers to Canaan as Israel's habitation. In Jer. 25:30 it is not clear whether it refers to the Jerusalem temple or to Yahweh's heavenly sanctuary.

[1] On this see the discussion of Ps. 68:8-11 above, §A, and the discussion of the ark in J in chap. 1, §A.

[2] Cf. Cross, "The Divine Warrior," pp. 22-23, 26, 28.

[3] For Gunkel's form-critical grouping of these psalms see Johnson, "The Psalms," p. 166.

[4] A pre-exilic date is argued especially by those who advance one or another "myth and ritual" hypothesis as for example Mowinckel, Psalms, I, 116-118. The same is true of Weiser, Psalms, pp. 33-34, 62-63, 91-92, who stresses the all-pervasiveness of an ancient covenant renewal ritual in these and many other psalms. A special case in point is Kraus who argued for the dependence of all these psalms on Deutero-Isaiah in his earlier work, Königsherrschaft Gottes, pp. 112-143, but later partly

less certain, but of secondary importance for the purposes of this study, and may be left open as an unsettled issue.[1] The present study is concerned primarily with the interrelation and development of certain theological symbols and motifs which did indeed arise out of cultic settings, but which nevertheless tended to assume a certain independence as poetic and partially reflective literary expressions of faith.

The term Elyon occurs twice in this group of psalms as a title for Yahweh (Pss. 47:3; 97:9). In Psalm 97 the honorific hymnic acclamation

---

repudiated this view in favor of a pre-exilic origin for 93, 99 and perhaps 47 in Psalmen, I, xliii-xliv, 349; cf. II, 647-648, 665-666, 671-672, 677, 682-683. A comprehensive presentation of arguments for the early monarchic origins of 93 and 98 is given by E. Lipinski, La royauté de Yahwé dans la poésie et le culte de l'ancien Israël (Verhandelingen van de Kininklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van Belgie, Klasse der letteren, XXVII, 55; Brussel: Paleis der Acadamiën, 1965), pp. 163-172, 333-335. But, strangely, he regards 97 as a Maccabean composition for the rededication of the temple in 164, based on older traditional material, p. 270. But as pointed out by Schmid, "Kulttraditionen," p. 185, a pre-exilic dating of some of these psalms makes it likely that all are pre-exilic. See also Johnson, "The Psalms," pp. 193-195, who points out that the similarities to Deutero-Isaiah can just as well prove Deutero-Isaiah's dependence on psalms of this type. Clements, God and Temple, pp. 70-71, assumes a pre-exilic date without discussion.

[1] Mowinckel's theory of an annual New Year ritual enthronement of Yahweh and Weiser's theory of a New Year covenant renewal and cultic theophany ritual have been discussed briefly in the Introduction, §§B,D. For various criticisms of such overly schematic reconstructions see Noth, "Gott, König, Volk," pp. 188-229. See Kraus, Worship, pp. 8-10, 17-18, 205-208, for a critical rejection of Mowinckel's views, and pp. 23, 208-209, for similar criticisms of Weiser. Cf. also his remarks in Psalmen, I, 201-205, 373-374. Ringgren, Israelite Religion, pp. 190-200, gives a critical summary of both theories and suggests in a rather vague and tentative way the possibility of retaining both by associating the covenant festival with Shechem and the kingship of Yahweh with Jerusalem. Even Johnson, who accepts the main lines of Mowinckel's approach, expresses important reservations in "The Psalms," pp. 195-196.

kî-'attâ ^{c}elyôn ^{c}al-kol-hā'āreṣ[1] has as its synonymous parallel *m^{e}'ōd na^{ca}lêtâ ^{c}al-kol-'^{e}lōhîm* (vs. 9). This alliteration and play on the words *^{c}elyôn*, *^{c}ālâ*, and *^{c}al* reinforces poetically the Canaanite-style picture of the high god's authority over the earth.[2] There is probably an indirect allusion to the ark and cherubim in the word *kis^{e}'ô* (vs. 2). One may thus assume that the opening acclamation, *yhwh mālāk* (vs. 1), presupposes cultic symbolism involving the ark as is more clearly the case in Psalms 99:1 and 93:1.[3] The theophany description may reflect further symbolism associated with the ark.[4] Here the cloud and fire elements merge into a picture of Yahweh's cosmic power and *kābôd* overwhelming the earth and forcing both the pagan nations of the world and their gods to acknowledge and worship him (vss. 2-7). The title *ʼᵃdôn kol-hāʼāreṣ* at the climax of the theophany description proper (vs. 5) is almost synonymous in its contextual meaning with *ᶜelyôn ᶜal-kol-hāʼāreṣ* (vs. 9). In one passage already discussed the same term, *ʼᵃdôn kol-hāʼāreṣ*, is directly associated with the ark (Josh. 3:11,13).[1] Thus there are several indications that in this psalm the ark is the symbol of Yahweh manifesting his power over the gods by means of a cosmic theophany appearance. For the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judah, here designated by the terms Zion and daughters of Judah, this universal manifestation of Yahweh's kingship represents deliverance and victory (vss. 8-11). This hint of the ancient holy war symbolism of the ark has been transformed by assimilation to the cosmic and mythological picture of Elyon as king over the pantheon. The ark as a cultic symbol represents Yahweh's cosmic and heavenly kingship, depicted partly in terms of the Canaanite picture of the high god and his pantheon. However, the basically Israelite theophany theme and the implicit holy war symbolism both traditionally associated with the ark take the place of a myth of the battle of the gods.[2]

---

[1] On the deletion of *yhwh* for the sake of meter see Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 670.

[2] Cf. Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, p. 88.

[3] The question of whether to translate this acclamation as stative, "Yahweh is king," or as ingressive, "Yahweh has become king," has often been debated as a supposedly decisive point of evidence for or against the hypothesis of a cultic act of divine enthronement in connection with the ark. The translation, "Yahweh has become king," advocated by Mowinckel, *Psalms*, II, 222-224, is rejected by Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, pp. 57-58, 68, who translates emphatically, "It is Yahweh who is king." Kraus, *Königsherrschaft Gottes*, pp. 3-9, accepted the translation, "Jahwe ist König geworden." But in *Psalmen*, I, 202-203, he largely reverses himself, distinguishing between subject-verb word order as stative (Pss. 93:1; 96:10; 97:1; 99:1) and verb-subject word order as ingressive (Pss. 47:9; Is. 52:7). Lipinski, *La royauté de Yahwé*, pp. 336-391, who discusses the problem exhaustively, concludes that the subject-verb sequence is emphatic and represents a polemic modification of the Canaanite formula *ba^{c}al mālak* to proclaim Yahweh's kingship rather than Baal's. The probability that Yahweh's kingship may have been dramatized cultically each year need not imply that he lost and then regained his kingship in the manner of Baal. Instead Psalm 93:2 implies the opposite. Cf. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 193-197.

[4] See chap. 2, §D. On the form and imagery of this theophany passage see Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 4, 28-30, 124, 161. He fails to notice the possible connection with the ark.

In Psalm 47 Elyon again occurs with much the same contextual associations. The synonymous parallelism of verse 3, *kî-yhwh ᶜelyôn nôrāʼ* / *melek gādôl ᶜal-kol-hāʼāreṣ*, makes the identification *yhwh* = *ᶜelyôn* = *melek gādôl* in a formal and unambiguous way. Yahweh's kingship over the earth as Elyon is interpreted in holy war terms as his subjecting the nations of the world to Israel (vs. 4).[1] The next line (vs. 5) seems to relate this specifically to Israel's conquest of Canaan and perhaps also to David's empire and the transferral of the ark to Jerusalem.[2] The expressions *naḥ^{a}lātēnû* and *g^{e}'ôn ya^{ca}qōb* represent this partly in terms of the Canaanite idea of the high god Elyon assigning territories to the various peoples of the earth as in Deuteronomy 32:8-9.[3] The second half of the psalm reflects a ceremonial procession of the ark celebrating and proclaiming Yahweh's kingship. In verse 6 the verb *^{c}ālâ* is probably a technical term for such a procession, and perhaps at the same time a play on *^{c}elyôn* as is also *na^{c}alâ* in verse 10 (cf. Ps. 97:9). The procession and the expression *^{c}ālâ* may also symbolize the ascension of Yahweh as Elyon to his heavenly palace.[4] The accompanying ceremonial shouts (*t^{e}rû^{c}â*; cf. *hārî^{c}û*, vs. 2) and trumpet blowing (*qôl šôpār*) echo the ancient holy war symbolism of the ark when it was carried in procession.[5]

---

[1] On the ark in Josh. 3 see chap. 1, §B. This expression also occurs in Mic. 4:13 and Zech. 4:14; 6:5.

[2] On the transformation of the mythical theme of a battle of the gods into the theme of Yahweh's judgment of the gods see Mowinckel, *Psalms*, I, 148-149, and Weiser, *Psalms*, p. 51.

---

[1] On the meaning of *dbr* hiphil here and in Ps. 18:48 see *KB* which gives the meaning "zurücktreiben" and relates it to a different root than *dbr* piel meaning "speak"; cf. M. Dahood, *Psalms 1-50: Introduction, Translation and Notes* (Anchor Bible, 16; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1966), p. 118.

[2] Cf. Fretheim, *Ark*, pp. 174-175.

[3] See above §§C,D; cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 350-351, Weiser, *Psalms*, pp. 376-377, and Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 198.

[4] For the significance of *^{c}ālâ* here compare Pss. 24:3; 68:19; 122:4 and see the discussions in Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 191-192, 198-199, Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, p. 66, Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 351, and Mowinckel, *Psalms*, I, 172.

[5] On *hērîa^{c}* and *t^{e}rû^{c}â* referring especially to the holy war shout see von Rad, *Heilige Krieg*, p. 11, and the classification of uses in *BDB*. Only once is there a reference to this shout in connection with the acclamation of an Israelite king (I Sam. 10:24 referring to Saul); cf.

The interpretation of the word *’ᵉlôhîm* in verses 7-8 is disputed. But Dahood has plausibly interpreted it as vocative in function and translated *zammᵉrû ’ᵉlôhîm zammᵉrû* (7a) as "sing praises, you gods, sing praises," and again, in chiastic relation to this, *’ᵉlôhîm zammᵉrû maškîl* (8b) as "O gods, sing a skillful song."[1] If this interpretation is correct this passage, like Psalm 97:9, represents Yahweh's heavenly dominion over the gods as a counterpart to his earthly dominion over the nations (vss. 8a,9a,10). His symbolic enthronement in connection with the ark and cherubim is probably referred to again in the words *’ᵉlôhîm yāšab ᶜal-qissē’ qodšô* (vs. 9b).

F. The Ark and Cherubim as Holy War Theophany Symbols in the Psalms of Yahweh's Kingship: Psalms 99, 93, 29, 96

The most explicit allusion to the ark and cherubim as a throne symbol occurs in Psalm 99 in the expression *yôšēb kᵉrûbîm* which occurs as the synonymous parallel of *yhwh mālāk* (vs. 1). Echoes of the ancient holy war theophany tradition are again evident.[2] Despite textual or syntactical difficulties the word *ᶜōz* at the beginning of verse 4 is probably

---

Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 197. On the association of this cry with the ark as a holy war symbol see I Sam. 4:5-6, II Sam. 6:15; cf. Fretheim, *Ark*, p. 173.

[1] Dahood, *Psalms 1-50*, pp. 283, 285-286. He argues against acceptance of the reading *lē’lōhîm* of some Hebrew mss. (cf. *BH*) or the LXX reading *tōi theōi hēmōn = lē’lōhēnû* in vs. 7a on the ground that this is likely a scribal attempt to improve a more difficult reading. However, Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 348, accepts the reading of the LXX because of the close parallelism with *lᵉmalkēnû* in vs. 7b and emends to *yhwh* in vs. 8b. Dahood's attempt, pp. 283-284, to find a similar vocative in *lē’lōhîm* of vs. 1 on the basis of the Ugaritic vocative particle *l* is possible but less convincing.

[2] Cf. Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 18-19, 112, 161.

another allusion to the ark as the symbol of Yahweh's power, as in Psalms 132:8 and 78:61.[1] Still another allusion to the ark may be detected in the refrain, verse 5, in the words w^{e}hištaḥ^{a}wû lah^{a}dôm raglāyw.[2] However the parallel in the recurrence of the refrain, verse 9, is w^{e}hištaḥ^{a}wû l^{e}har qodšô, referring to Zion but with possible cosmological overtones.[3] In verse 2, immediately following the reference to Yahweh's enthronement in connection with the cherubim, Zion is represented as the center or seat of Yahweh's exalted dominion and kingship over the earth in the words yhwh b^{e}ṣiyyôn gādôl / w^{e}rām hû’ ^{c}al-kol-hā’āreṣ. The first half of this line recalls the line kî-yhwh ^{c}elyôn nôrā’ / melek gādôl ^{c}al-kol-hā’āreṣ in Psalm 47:3 where gādôl stresses the supreme suzerainty of the divine king Yahweh Elyon over the earth. The second half of the line recalls the line kî-’attâ ^{c}elyôn ^{c}al-kol-hā’āreṣ / m^e’ōd na^{ca}lêtâ ^{c}al-kol-’^{e}lōhîm in Psalm 97:9. In fact, the word rām seems to function almost as a synonym of ^{c}elyôn and na^{ca}lêtâ. Psalm 99 thus illustrates the continuing centrality of the ark in the symbolism of Zion. At the same time

---

[1] On ^{c}ōz as a term for the mysterious divine power associated with the ark see chap. 1, §§C,E. The commonly suggested emendation of the vocalization w^{ec}ōz melek to w^e^{c}az mālak in vs. 3 is not entirely satisfactory since the adjective ^{c}az is nowhere else used with reference to Yahweh, let alone as a divine title (cf. BDB). However some partial analogies can be found for an emendation to b^{ec}ōz mālak. See for example the use of the noun ^{c}ōz in b^{ec}ōz yhwh and analogous expressions in Pss. 21:2,14; 74:13; 78:26; Ex. 15:13; Mic. 5:3. See also the use of ^{c}ōz in Pss. 93:1; 96:6,7 and the discussion of the pillar Boaz, chap. 2, §D.

[2] In Ps. 132:7 ništaḥ^{a}weh lah^{a}dôm raglāyw occurs in immediate connection with an explicit reference to the ark. In I Chr. 28:2 w^{e}lah^{a}dôm raglê ’^{e}lōhênû is given explicitly as a synonym for la’^{a}rôn b^{e}rît-yhwh. For the possible cosmic symbolism see Is. 66:1, haššāmayim kis^e’î w^{e}hā’āreṣ h^{a}dôm raglāyw.

[3] On the cosmological connotations of har qodšô see chap. 5, §B.

verses 5 and 9 show how the throne and footstool symbolism of the ark could be transferred to Zion itself as Yahweh's holy mountain.[1] The comparisons with Psalms 47 and 97 show how the picture of Elyon as king over the pantheon was associated in partly demythologized form with the throne symbolism of the ark and cherubim. The picture of Yahweh as *^{c}elyôn* and *melek* tended to be influenced at the same time by the traditional holy war and theophany symbolism of the ark.

Psalm 93 reveals more clearly the adaptation of the traditional throne symbolism of the ark and cherubim to the kind of Canaanite cultic symbolism in which the sanctuary is the earthly representation or counterpart of the cosmic or heavenly dwelling place of the deity.[2] The words *^{c}ōz* (vs. 1) and *kis'^{a}kā* (vs. 2) in close connection with the opening acclamation, *yhwh mālāk*, clearly allude to the ark as the symbol of Yahweh's power and kingship. Yet the cultic acclamation and glorification of Yahweh in connection with the ark merges into a picture of Yahweh's primeval and eternal cosmic enthronement on high over the chaos waters (vss. 2-4), maintaining the stability of the world (vs. 1b). As an illustration of the Canaanite background of this picture, Kraus cites the passage in the Ugaritic Baal and Anat cycle in which Baal attacks Mot and then apparently ascends his royal throne.[1] One may also note that *n^{e}hārôt* in Psalm 93:3 is reminiscent of *nhrm* (dual form) associated with the cosmic dwelling-place of El in the Ugaritic texts.[2] This perhaps indicates that the mythological themes associated with El Elyon and applied to Yahweh in the Jerusalem cult included Baal's fight with the chaos ocean as well as the picture of El as king of the pantheon. Echoes of the ancient hymnic-theophany tradition may also be detected here.[3] But in Psalm 93 these themes have been assimilated and demythologized. There is only a faint hint of mythological struggle, no occurrence of the titles El or Elyon, no allusions to a pantheon, and no direct theophany expression. Instead, the hymnic description of the roaring and raging of the waters is introduced simply to accentuate and impart cosmic dimensions to the glorious power and kingship of Yahweh symbolized by the ark in the temple on Zion.[4]

---

[1] Note Lam. 2:1 where *h^{a}dôm raglāyw* is in synonymous parallelism with *tip'eret yiśrā'ēl* and *bat-ṣiyyôn*, probably showing how language originally associated with the ark could be used to refer to Zion in general; so also *m^{e}qôm raglāyw*, Is. 60:13.

[2] For a wide-ranging comparative discussion of temples, cities and sacred mountains as local symbols or representations of a cosmic or heavenly prototype see Eliade, *Cosmos and History*, pp. 6-17. See Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 1-11, 65-69, for a recent discussion focusing on Canaan, Israel, and the Solomonic temple. Cf. also Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, p. 66.

Psalm 29, which Gunkel does not include in his list of the psalms of Yahweh's kingship, is nevertheless closely related to them in content and presents much the same picture as Psalm 93 but in a more archaic and Canaanite-like form.[5] Using the Canaanite-style picture of El's kingship the opening lines call the pantheon (*b^{e}nê ʼēlîm*) to acknowledge Yahweh for his *kābôd wā^{c}ōz* and the *k^{e}bôd š^{e}mô*, probably alluding to the traditional theme of Yahweh's power and cultic theophany manifestations in connection with the ark (vss. 1-2).[1] The close connection of *š^{e}mô* with *kābôd* and *^{c}ōz* indicates that the expressions such as *šēm-yhwh* and *š^{e}mô* were likewise closely associated with the ark and its associated theophany connotations.[2] The cosmic dimensions of the theophany are clearly evident in the imagery of Yahweh thundering forth as *ʼēl-hakkābôd* from above the chaos waters (vs. 3). The picture of Yahweh's cosmic power and might manifest in the form of a destructive thunderstorm over the Lebanon mountains could almost as well be a Canaanite hymn to the storm god Baal-Hadad (vss. 4-9a).[3] The closing part of the psalm shows clearly that this majestic picture of Yahweh's cosmic enthronement is conceived in terms of the ark in the temple as its cultic counterpart. Yahweh, glori-

---

[1] Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 650, citing *UM*, 49:V:1-6; cf. *ANET*, p. 141a. Kraus notes the terms *dkym*, *rbm* and *lksi mlkh* corresponding to similar terms in Ps. 93.

[2] *UM*, 49:I:5; 2 *Aqht*:VI:47.

[3] So Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 27, 93.

[4] Cf. Lipinski, *La royauté de Yahwé*, p. 142.

[5] That this is a Yahwistic adaptation of a Canaanite Baal hymn was first argued by H. L. Ginsberg, "A Phoenician Hymn in the Psalter," *Atti del XIX Congresso Internazionale degli Orientalisti* (Roma, 1935), pp. 472-476, as cited with approval by Dahood, *Psalms 1-50*, p. 175; similarly

---

Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, p. 129, who dates the psalm in the tenth century. On the similarities between this psalm and Ugaritic poetry see F. M. Cross Jr., "Notes on a Canaanite Psalm in the Old Testament," *BASOR*, No. 117 (1950), pp. 19-21.

[1] Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes*, pp. 46-47. Dahood, *Psalms 1-50*, p. 176, and others have suggested that *b^{e}nê ʼēlîm* here refers to the stars as perhaps in *UM*, 76:I:3-4 (*bn il* in parallelism with *p]ḫr kkbm*); cf. Job 38:7 (*kôk^{e}bê bōqer* in parallelism with *kol-b^{e}nê ʼ^{e}lōhîm*). Nevertheless, the idea of the pantheon is still present even if identified with the stars; cf. Ps. 89:6-8; Deut. 32:8-9; Ps. 82:1. That the term *hadrat* here and in Ps. 96:7 means "theophany appearance" has been widely accepted on the basis of *UM*, *Krt*:155, where *hdrt* is in synonymous parallelism to *ḥlm* referring to a dream vision bestowed by *il* upon *krt*. Cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 233.

[2] Cf. II Sam. 6:2; Ps. 20:2,6,8; Is. 30:27.

[3] Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes*, pp. 47-49. See also the sources cited by Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 235, who quotes a similar passage from a Babylonian hymn to Ellil. On the theophany language of Psalm 29 see Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 30-31, 89, 108, 124; cf. 73-88.

fied by the pantheon in his heavenly palace (*b^{e}hêkālô*), sits enthroned *lammabbûl* as *melek* *^{c}ôlām* (vss. 9b-10).[1] But the final verse of the psalm shows that this cosmic representation of Yahweh's power and majesty is intended to point toward his bestowal of *^{c}ōz* upon his people, an expression which probably reflects the traditional function of the ark in the temple in Zion as a symbol of divinely given victory.[2]

Psalm 96 further illustrates the same symbolic imagery. The cosmological themes of Yahweh as ruler of the pantheon and creator are turned into a mocking comparison of the insignificance of the gods to the awesome power and greatness of Yahweh (vss. 4-5; cf. the words *nôrā'* *hû'* *^{c}al-kol-'^{e}lôhîm*).[3] In this context there occurs another probable allusion to the ark in the temple as the cultic symbol of his power and theophany manifestations, *hôd-w^{e}hādār* *l^{e}pānāyw* / *^{c}ōz* *w^{e}tip'eret* *b^{e}miqdāšô* (vs. 6).[4] Using language in part identical with and perhaps dependent upon Psalm 29, the repeated calls to the whole earth to worship Yahweh and to acknowledge his cosmic power continue to presuppose the ark as the earthly symbol of this power (vss. 7-9). But, whereas Psalm 29 calls upon the gods to acknowledge Yahweh, Psalm 96 calls upon the nations.[1] The remainder of Psalm 96 pictures the world as celebrating the kingship of Yahweh as he comes in a cosmic theophany manifestation to rule the earth (vss. 10-13). There is no adequate reason to regard this closing portion of the psalm as any more "eschatological" than the preceding portions. The climactic exclamation, *kî* *bā’* *kî* *bā’* (vs. 13; cf. 98:9) must be interpreted in the light of the words *w^{e}yābô’* *melek* *hakkābôd* in Psalm 24:7,9, and perhaps also *yhwh* *missînay* *bā’* in Deuteronomy 33:2 and *yhwh* *bā’* *missînay* in Psalm 68:18 (emended).[2] Psalm 24:7-10 is clearly a

---

[1] Cf. Ps. 104:1-4 which pictures Yahweh as establishing his heavenly dwelling place above the waters as one of his first acts of creation.

[2] Dahood, *Psalms* *1-50*, pp. 175, 180, interprets *^{c}ōz* as referring to the divinely given victory over foes, but does not connect this with the ark as a holy war symbol.

[3] The word *'^{e}lîlîm* used here and in 97:7 as a derogatory and mocking term for pagan gods and idols is a favorite polemic word of Isaiah (2:8,18,20; 10:10,11; 19:1,3; 31:7).

[4] In Ps. 21:6 Yahweh's *hôd* *w^{e}hādār* is bestowed upon the Davidic king who depends upon Yahweh's *^{c}ōz (21:2,14)*; cf. 45:5. It is predicated of Yahweh in another cosmological context, Ps. 104:1; cf. 111:3; 145:5 and Job 40:10. In Ps. 78:60 the terms *^{c}uzzô* and *tip'artô* refer very clearly to the ark in the context of an allusion to its removal from Shiloh and capture by the Philistines; cf. 89:18. In Is. 52:1 the same terms are predicated of Zion itself rather than the ark as the symbol of Yahweh's majesty (*^{c}ûzz^{e}kā*, *tip'art^{e}kā*); cf. Lam. 2:1. This contrast confirms the pre-exilic date of Ps. 96 and shows how eventually, especially in Deutero-Isaiah, the accumulated symbolism of the ark came to be associated with Zion itself independently of the ark. I Chr. 16:23-33 incorporates Ps. 96 into the composite psalm which it associates with cultic

---

service before the ark after David installed it in the tent sanctuary in the City of David. This further confirms the view that Ps. 96 had been traditionally associated with the ark cult in the pre-exilic period. The attempt by Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 666, to explain away this evidence for the pre-exilic date of Ps. 96 is unconvincing. Ps. 105, which also has a probable allusion to the ark (vs. 4), is likewise incorporated into the composite psalm in I Chr. 16:8-22.

[1] The following half lines are identical in Pss. 29:1-2 and 96:7-9: *hābû* *lyhwh* *kābôd* *wā^{c}ōz*; *hābû* *lyhwh* *k^{e}bôd* *š^{e}mô*; *hištaḥ^{a}wû* *lyhwh* *b^{e}hadrat-qōdeš*. But for the words *hābû* *lyhwh* *b^{e}nê* *’ēlîm* in Ps. 29:1 the corresponding half line in 96:7 is *habû* *lyhwh* *k^{e}bôd* *š^{e}mô*.

[2] See the discussion of Ps. 68:18 and Deut. 33:2 above. The word *bā’* can, from a grammatical point of view, be taken equally well as a participle or a perfect. One can debate between a translation "he has come" and "he comes," or "he is coming," in a way somewhat analogous to the debate over the translation of *yhwh* *mālāk* discussed above. The view of Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 668, 677, 679, that the meaning is eschatological is based on his assumption that the psalm is dependent on Deutero-Isaiah. But the passages he cites for the eschatological use of *bw’*, Is. 40:10; 59:19-20; 60:1; 62:11, can be better explained as imagery dependent upon the pre-exilic use of the word in cultic contexts involving the ark as in Pss. 24:7,9; 96:13; 98:9; and 68:18.

liturgy for use in connection with the ceremonial entrance of the ark into the temple. The word bā' in Psalms 96:13 and 98:9 may therefore refer to the cosmic prototype symbolically portrayed in the cultic actions associated with the ark. The cosmic aspect of the imagery has seemingly displaced the more archaic imagery of Yahweh's theophany visitation coming from Sinai (Deut. 32:2 and Ps. 68:18).[1]

On the whole Psalm 98 is so similar to Psalm 96 that it need not be discussed separately except to point out that it, too, reflects much fluidity of movement between cultic symbolism and cosmic prototype. For example verse 4 has cosmic or at least universal overtones, verses 5-6 allude to cultic actions in connection with the ark and temple, verses 7-9 are explicitly cosmic echoing old mythological themes.

G. The Holy War Symbolism of the Ark Procession: Psalms 24, 80

Psalm 24 illustrates many of the points under discussion in this chapter. The hymnic lines at the beginning reflect the same cosmological imagery stemming from Jebusite Elyon mythology as the psalms of Yahweh's enthronement (vss. 1-2). But explicitly mythological elements such as occur in Psalm 89:5-11 are missing here, leaving only the theme of Yahweh as sole creator and owner of the universe which is itself pictured impersonally. The last part of the psalm reflects a ceremonial procession of the ark as the symbol of Yahweh's entrance into the temple (vss. 7-10).[2]

---

[1] Cf. Jeremias, Theophanie, pp. 115-117.

[2] Most recent commentators regard such a procession as the background of this psalm, as for example Kraus, Psalmen, I, 194-195, 205-206, Johnson, Sacral Kingship, pp. 63-65, Mowinckel, Psalms, I, 177, Dahood,

The etiological traditions which constitute the basis of the ceremony are probably those found in the stories of David installing the ark at Jerusalem (II Sam. 6; cf. Ps. 132:1-9) and of Solomon installing it in the temple (I Kgs. 8).[1] The ark as the focal point of the ceremony calls forth the traditional imagery of holy war enhanced by the picture of Yahweh as king with its cosmological overtones.[2] The custom of a ceremonial entrance through the gates of the temple on occasions of thanksgiving for divinely given victory in battle is evident in Psalm 118:10-21.[3] Psalm 24 is hardly itself a victory hymn. Therefore the holy war titles applied to Yahweh in verses 7-10 are all the more clearly indicative of the persistence of traditional holy war ideas and themes in connection with

---

Psalms 1-50, p. 151, and Fretheim, Ark, pp. 168-170. The attempt by Weiser, Psalms, pp. 234-235, to reject this view and suggest instead that it refers only to a cultic theophany in the temple is unconvincing. The view of Eissfeldt, "Jahwe Zebaoth," p. 115, "Silo und Jerusalem," pp. 420, 422-423, and "Psalm 132" (1959), KS, III, 481-482, that vss. 7-10 incorporate a fragment of the liturgy first composed and used in connection with the initial entry of the ark into the city gates of Zion under David is worthy of consideration. Cf. Cross, "The Divine Warrior," pp. 19-21.

[1] See especially Kraus, Worship, pp. 207-208, 213-214, and Schreiner, Sion-Jerusalem, pp. 187-190. Schreiner's attempt to deny the unity of the psalm is contrary to the view of most recent interpreters and is unnecessary when one understands vss. 3-6 as an "entrance torah" similar to Ps. 15; cf. Fretheim, Ark, pp. 166-169.

[2] Cf. Kraus, Psalmen, I, 200, and Cross, "The Divine Warrior," pp. 22-24.

[3] This inference can be made regardless of one's interpretation of the composition and cultic setting of Ps. 118 as a whole. Kraus, Psalmen, II, 803, 806, regards the psalm as a composition incorporating older passages including a battle victory song. Weiser, Psalms, pp. 725-728, thinks the speaker in vss. 5-19,21 is the king. Johnson, Sacral Kingship, pp. 114-117, sees a ritual battle of the king against "Death" as the cultic background of the psalm. Mowinckel, Psalms, I, 180, thinks the battle description sums up the entire history of Israel in one concentrated picture.

the ark and its cult.[1] The rare word *ᶜizzûz* applied as a title to Yahweh may be an intentional play on the word *ᶜōz* referring to the ark as the symbol of holy war (vs. 8).[2] At the same time it provides assonance in the combination *ᶜizzûz wᵉgibbôr*. The picture of Yahweh as a warrior, *gibbôr milḥāmâ*, is not dependent upon the picture of Yahweh as king. Instead, it is probably a variation of an ancient hymnic holy war title for Yahweh, *’îš milḥāmâ* (Ex. 15:3).[3] It recurs as a special title for Yahweh referring to his protective presence as king in Zion in Zephaniah 3:17 in the context of an eschatological passage reminiscent of the psalms of Yahweh's kingship and Deutero-Isaiah. But the climactic title in Psalm 24 is *yhwh ṣᵉbā’ôt* (vs. 10), the traditional holy war title associated with the ark at Shiloh and brought to Jerusalem with the ark.[4] The title *melek hakkābôd* thus reflects the assimilation of Canaanite Elyon imagery to the ancient picture of Yahweh as a warrior hero. Isaiah 6:1-6 shows that this title along with *yhwh ṣ^{e}bā'ôt* came to be associated with the throne symbolism of the ark in the temple.[1]

---

[1] Cf. von Rad, *Heilige Krieg*, p. 82, Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 201, 206, and Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 188-190.

[2] The word *ᶜizzûz* apparently means "strong warrior." Its only other occurrence is in the combination *ḥayil wᵉᶜizzûz* in synonymous parallelism with *rekeb-wāsûs* (Is. 43:17).

[3] The phrase *’îš milḥāmâ* and its variants is a frequent term referring to human warriors or soldiers. The phrase *gibbôr milḥāmâ* and its variants is much less frequent. But the phrase *gibbôr ḥayil* and its variants is frequent. Cf. "*gibbôr*" and "*milḥāmâ*," *BDB*, and de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 70, 220. The phrase *’ēl gibbôr* occurs in divine titles from the late monarchic and post-monarchic periods (Is. 10:21; also as a messianic title in Is. 9:5) and *hā’ēl haggādôl haggibbôr wᵉhannôrā’* (Deut. 10:17; Neh. 9:32; and, without *wᵉhannôrā’*, Jer. 32:18). Also noteworthy is Ps. 78:65, *wayyîqaṣ kᵉyāšēn ’ᵃdônāy* / *kᵉgibbôr mitrônēn miyyāyin*, in the hymnic recital of the story of the defeat of the Philistines by the ark recalling I Sam. 4-6. Cf. Cross, "The Divine Warrior," p. 24.

[4] Chap. 1, §D; cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 201, 206, and Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 188-190.

The continuing centrality of the ark as a holy war symbol during the later period of the monarchy is indicated in the communal lament preserved in Psalm 80.[2] In the introductory appeal for a theophany intervention (*hôpîa^{c}*), Yahweh is addressed by the ancient title *yôšēb hakk^{e}rûbîm* deriving from the ark cult at Shiloh (vs. 2).[3] The way in which such an appeal might be made is vividly illustrated by Hezekiah's prayer before the ark during the Assyrian invasion (I Kgs. 19:14-19 = Is. 37:14-20). In Psalm 80:3 the imperative invocation of Yahweh's holy war might uses the word *g^{e}bûrāt^{e}kā* rather than *^{c}uzz^{e}kā*, but with the same meaning.[4] The appeal repeated in a series of refrains uses the holy war title *yhwh ṣ^{e}bāʾôt* (vss. 4,8,15,20).[1] But the ark in this context is not so much a direct embodiment of Yahweh's power as a symbol of his intervention from his cosmic dwelling place, as indicated in the words *habbeṭ miššāmayim* in the varied form of the refrain in verse 15. This agrees with the conception of Yahweh's holy war intervention reflected in the Deuteronomic prayer attributed to Solomon in connection with the installation of the ark in the temple (I Kgs. 8:44-45). Here prayer for Yahweh's help in battle is to be directed toward Jerusalem and the house built for Yahweh's "name." But Yahweh will hear and respond from heaven.

---

[1] Cf. the words *yôšeb ^{c}al-kissē'* and *hahêkāl* (vs. 1), *yhwh ṣ^{e}bā'ôt* and *k^{e}bôdô* (vs. 3), and *hammelek yhwh ṣ^{e}bā'ôt* (vs. 6).

[2] The references to the tribes of Ephraim, Benjamin and Manasseh (vs. 3) and to depredations by an invading enemy (vss. 13-14,17-19) have given rise to various attempts to relate Ps. 80 to some known historical situation. Several scholars, following the words *hyper tou assyriou* added to the superscription in the LXX, have attempted to relate it to one or another of the Assyrian campaigns during the second half of the eighth century. Since both Benjamin and the two Joseph tribes are mentioned, opinions differ on whether the psalm is northern or southern in origin. For summaries of various theories see Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 556-557, and O. Eissfeldt, "Psalm 80" (1953), *KS*, III, 221-232. Kraus's own suggestion of a time in the reign of Josiah is also plausible. In any case the title *yôšēb hakk^{e}rûbîm* more likely points to the ark cult in Jerusalem rather than to a continuation of Shiloh cult traditions in the Northern Kingdom as advocated by Eissfeldt.

[3] I Sam. 4:4; II Sam. 6:2; II Kgs. 19:15 = Is. 37:16; Ps. 99:1. Cf. chap. 1, §C, and Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 557-558.

[4] In Ps. 21:14 *g^{e}bûrāt^{e}kā* occurs in the parallel half line following the holy war invocation, *rûmâ yhwh b^{ec}uzzekā*, which is probably another variant of the ark chant, *qûmâ yhwh*, of Num. 10:35 and Pss. 82:8; 132:8; cf. Ps. 68:2. The word *g^{e}bûrâ* is also used in connection with the deliverance at the Sea of Reeds (Ps. 106:8), Yahweh's dominion over the

H. Summary

This chapter has interpreted the significance of the ark and its symbolism in relation to Zion on the basis of several hymn-like psalms from the early period of the monarchy and the psalms of Yahweh's kingship. The premonarchic function of the ark as a holy war symbol, together with its installation as the central object of the Yahwistic cult at Jerusalem sponsored by David and Solomon, tended to make Zion the symbolic goal of the holy war victories of the exodus and conquest traditions and the continuing focal point of Yahweh's holy war presence and power. On the basis of the premonarchic theophany symbolism of the ark and cherubim at Shiloh, Yahweh's holy war intervention continued to be pictured partly in terms of the prototypal Sinai theophany enhanced by storm god imagery of

---

nations (Ps. 66:7), and his cosmic dominion (65:7; 89:14; Job 26:14). On the association of theophany language with the battle intervention of Yahweh in this passage see Jeremias, *Theophanie*, p. 147.

[1] Restoring *yhwh ṣ^{e}bāʾôt* in vss. 4,5,8,15,20 where *ʾ^{e}lōhîm* has been inserted by an Elohistic redactor; cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 555. See chap. 1, §D.

Canaanite origin. With the assimilation of Jebusite El Elyon mythology at Jerusalem, the traditional picture of Yahweh as a mighty warrior was further enhanced by the Canaanite picture of the high god as king of the pantheon and creator of the universe enthroned in cosmic grandeur. The ark and cherubim in the temple on Mt. Zion thus became the earthly model of Yahweh's heavenly enthronement as king and the symbol of his universal dominion and power. His victorious theophany manifestations, pictured earlier as coming from Sinai or perhaps even from the temple itself, came to be pictured more and more as coming from heaven. His power to overcome Israel's earthly enemies was represented as the counterpart of his power over the gods and over the cosmos. His special relation to Israel and Zion was sometimes pictured in terms of the high god keeping a favored domain under his own care while delegating limited authority over other areas of the world to lesser divine beings who are judged and punished for misrule.

The older concreteness and particularity of the idea of holy war, in which the ark was a mana-charged, victory-creating cult object carried into battle, came gradually to be conceived in terms of the ark in the temple on Mt. Zion as symbols of Yahweh's cosmic dominion. This gave them a more abstract and universal meaning as the symbol of Israel's security in the presence of Yahweh. But concreteness and particularity were not totally lost. Zion represented the culmination of a *Heilsgeschichte* in which Israel participated cultically and in faith. As the prime symbol of security and trust in Yahweh, Zion as the place of the ark represented the possibility of deliverance in particular situations of distress. As a symbol, Zion thus held in tension two logically opposite ways of picturing divine power and activity, neither of which is tenable alone. The totally abstract and universal concept of divine power becomes meaningless, since it can say nothing about particulars and tends toward pantheism. But a concept of divine power limited to certain particular and concrete places and times is magical if these places and times are open to human manipulation; if they are beyond human control it becomes arbitrary fate and irrational chance. To be religiously meaningful a theistic symbol must perhaps embody such a tension between universality and particularity.

CHAPTER V. ZION, THE ARK, AND THE DAVIDIC DYNASTY IN THE ROYAL PSALMS

In chapter two it was argued that the ark and the traditional holy war ideas and practices associated with it were of central significance for David and his cultic and political establishment at Jerusalem. Chapter four showed how the old holy war and theophany symbolism of the ark traceable to Shiloh was modified and enhanced by the assimilation of cosmological and mythological ideas deriving from the Jebusite El Elyon cult of pre-Davidic Jerusalem and how this symbolism tended to be transferred to Zion itself as the sacred place of the ark. This chapter will show how the religious significance of the Davidic dynasty and its relation to Zion as presented in the Psalms was partly dependent upon these traditional ideas and practices associated with the ark, especially its holy war and theophany symbolism.

Within the ill-defined group of psalms commonly called royal psalms there is actually much diversity of formal structure.[1] Some of the most important of these psalms, especially 2, 110 and 132, seem to have been composed for use in connection with either the ceremonial installation of a Davidic king in office or some kind of annual ceremony renewing or celebrating the Davidic kingship. Most of the others are intercessory prayers, laments or thanksgivings in formal structure. In style some of these such as 18 and 89 seem to be intended for use by the king himself, while others such as 20 and 21 seem to be for the use of the community or its representatives praying on behalf of the king. This study will consider only those royal psalms in which Zion or holy war themes associated with the ark play an important role.

---

[1] Gunkel's basic list of royal psalms includes Pss. 2, 18, 20, 21, 45, 72, 101, 110, 132; cf. Johnson, "The Psalms," p. 167. Others such as Mowinckel, Psalms, I, 46-50, include in their lists a great many other psalms which allude to the king. The royal psalms of importance to the present study are all included in Gunkel's shorter list.

A. The Ark and the Election of Zion and David in Psalms 132 and 78

Mentioning the ark explicitly, Psalm 132 bases the theme of Yahweh's election of Zion and David upon David's act of bringing the ark to Zion.[1] In structure this psalm has a superficial resemblance to the community laments, especially Mowinckel's subcategory of "intercessory psalms."[2] This agrees with the usual two-part analysis in which verses 1-10 constitute a community prayer of intercession on behalf of the king, with verses 11-18 citing in response a pair of prophetic oracles concerning the election of the Davidic dynasty (vss. 11-12) and of Zion (vss. 13-18).[3]

---

[1] Ps. 132 plays an important part in most attempts to reconstruct the autumn festival; cf. Mowinckel, Psalms, I, 129, 147, 174-177, Johnson, Sacral Kingship, pp. 17-22, Weiser, Psalms, pp. 40-41, 779-782. It is the keystone of Kraus's attempt to reconstruct a "royal Zion festival" celebrating the election of Zion and the Davidic dynasty on the first day of Tabernacles, Königsherrschaft Gottes, pp. 51-59; cf. Psalmen, II, 872-879, and Worship, pp. 183-188, a theory accepted in several Old Testament theologies as an alternative to Mowinckel's festival of Yahweh's enthronement; cf. Eichrodt, Theology, I, 123-127, von Rad, Theology, I, 45-46, and E. Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, tr. A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1955), p. 266, note 2.

[2] Mowinckel, Psalms, I, 175-224, II, 61-62, 76, includes in this group Pss. 20, 21, 22 (all belonging to Gunkel's category of royal psalms), but not 132 which he considers the "libretto" of the cultic drama of the ark entering the sanctuary in the festival of Yahweh's enthronement.

[3] So in essence Gunkel as cited by Kraus, Psalmen, II, 877, Johnson, Sacral Kingship, pp. 18-20, Weiser, Psalms, pp. 779-780, Schreiner,

However a perceptive analysis by Fretheim has shown a more complex, but carefully balanced, a-b-a-b-c strophic structure.[1] In the form of a supplication verses 1-5 recall David's hardships in fulfilling his oath to obtain a place for Yahweh, meaning the establishment of the tent sanctuary for the ark at Zion (*māqôm lyhwh* = *miškānôt la^{ca}bîr ya^{ca}qōb*, vs. 5). Verses 10-12 constitute a second and parallel petition on behalf of David (vs. 10), answered by a divine oath promising the continuance of the Davidic dynasty in response to David's fulfillment of his oath concerning the ark (vss. 11-12). Verses 6-9 reflect a festival procession of the ark re-enacting or commemorating David's recovery of the ark from Kiriath-jearim (*m^{e}ṣānûhā biśdê-yā^{c}ar*, vs. 6), its installation in David's tent sanctuary at Zion (*l^{e}mišk^{e}nôtāyw*, vs. 7; cf. vs. 5), and its transferral to the Solomonic temple as a permanent resting place (*limnûḥātekā*, vs. 8). Interpreting the meaning of the establishment of the ark in the temple, verses 13-16 present a proclamation by Yahweh of his choice of Zion as his permanent place of enthronement in correlation with his preceding oath to the Davidic dynasty:

> *kî-bāḥar yhwh b^{e}ṣiyyôn* / *’iwwāh l^{e}môšāb lô*
> *zō’t-m^{e}nûḥātî ^{ca}dê-^{c}ad* / *pōh-’ēšēb kî ’iwwitîhā* (vss. 13-14).

The summarizing promise in verses 17-18 correlates the two acts of election by designating Zion as the place where Yahweh bestows continuing authority and holy war victory upon the Davidic king.

Sion-Jerusalem, p. 175. More complex analyses are given by Mowinckel, *Psalms*, I, 129, 174-177, Eissfeldt, "Psalm 132," pp. 483-485, and Kraus, II, 878.

[1] T. E. Fretheim, *Ark*, pp. 128-147, and "Psalm 132: A Form-Critical Study," *JBL*, LXXXVI (1967), 289-300.

The first two sections (vss. 1-9) may presuppose a variant poetic form of the ark story in which David's victory over the Philistines and conquest of Jerusalem, his bringing of the ark to the tent sanctuary at Zion, and the subsequent transferral of the ark to the temple, were tied more closely together than in the separate narratives of II Samuel 5-7 and I Kings 8.[1] The poetic tradition of David's oath concerning the ark (vss. 2-5) is otherwise unknown unless connected with the tradition preserved in II Samuel 7:2 concerning David's desire to build a "house" for the ark.[2] Verse 6, recalling the recovery of the ark at Jaar, is a poetic fragment which would be unintelligible apart from the story in II Samuel 6 (cf. I Sam. 4-6) of David bringing the ark from its place of exile at Baale-judah = Kiriath-jearim.[3] The line probably implies that David resolved while still at Ephratha = Bethlehem to recover the ark.[4] In conjunction with verses 3-5 this implies that David decided to conquer Jerusalem for the purpose of establishing a sanctuary for the ark.[1]

---

[1] Like Ps. 132, Ps. 78:60-72 and Chronicles both link this series of traditions closely together.

[2] Cf. Kraus, *Königsherrschaft Gottes*, pp. 51-59. Eissfeldt, "Psalm 132," p. 483, suggests that Ps. 132:3-5 may actually cite an ancient poem, perhaps composed by David himself, telling how the ark was brought to Jerusalem.

[3] The identity of *ś^{e}dê-ya^{c}ar* (Ps. 132:6) with the place variously called *qiryat y^{ec}ārîm* (Josh. 9:17; 15:60; I Sam. 6:21-7:2; I Chr. 13:5,6; II Chr. 1:4; etc.), *qiryat-ba^{c}al* (Josh. 15:60; 18:14-15), *ba^{ca}lâ* (Josh. 15:9-11,29; I Chr. 13:6), and *ba^{ca}lê y^{e}hûdâ* (II Sam. 6:2) is seldom questioned; cf. *BDB*, *KB* and V. R. Gold, "Kiriath-jearim," *IDB*, III, 37. The feminine singular suffixes on the verbs *š^{e}ma^{ca}nûhā* and *m^{e}ṣā'nûhā* must presuppose an original context in which *'ārôn* feminine (as in I Sam. 4:17 and II Chr. 8:11) had already occurred as antecedent; cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 877, 885, Oesterley, *Psalms*, pp. 531-532, and Eissfeldt, "Psalm 132," p. 483.

[4] The identification of *'eprātâ* with Bethlehem is presupposed by Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 885, and tentatively adopted by Fretheim, "Psalm 132," p. 297. But others identify it with the territory of Ephraim, and thus a synonymous parallel of *ś^{e}dê-yā^{c}ār*, Weiser, *Psalms*, p. 780, Eissfeldt, "Psalm 132," p. 484, Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 48-49, and S. Cohen, "Ephrathah," *IDB*, II, 122.

The throne and footstool symbolism of the ark and cherubim is presupposed in the cultic summons *ništaḥ^{a}weh* *lah^{a}dôm* *raglāyw* (vs. 7), and in the words *'iwwāh* *l^{e}môsāb* *lô* (vs. 13) and *pôh* *'ēšēb* *kî* *'iwwîtîhā* (vs. 14) proclaiming Yahweh's election of Zion.[2] The traditional holy war symbolism of the ark is apparent in the title *'^{a}rôn* *^{c}uzzekā* (vs. 8b) and the invocation *qûmâ* *yhwh* *limnûḥātekā* (vs. 8a) deriving from the ancient ark chant of Numbers 10:35 and Psalm 68:2 invoking Yahweh's victorious intervention against his enemies. On the basis of Ugaritic *l* meaning "from" *limnûḥātekā* may be translated "from your resting place," indicating that Yahweh's holy war power acts from Zion and possibly even that the ark was still carried forth into battle.[3] But in Psalm 132 the victorious power symbolized by the ark acts primarily on behalf of the Davidic king,

šām *'aṣmîaḥ* *qeren* *l^{e}dāwid* ...
'ôy^{e}bāyw *'albîš* *bōšet* (vss. 17-18).[4]

The word *miškānôt* (vss. 5,7) referring to David's tent sanctuary reflects the traditional terminology of the Shiloh sanctuary.[1] The word *m^{e}nûhâ* (vss. 8,14) referring to the temple as Yahweh's permanent resting place may depict the climax of the *Heilsgeschichte* in which Israel's possession of the promised land is completed through the holy war victories of David and the wanderings of the ark come to an end.[2] The dynastic oracle cited in verses 11-12 is introduced by a divine oath formula similar to those of Psalms 110:4 and 89:4 (cf. vss. 36,50).[3] II Samuel 7 and the contexts of Psalms 110 and 132 all indicate that such dynastic oracles were probably delivered in connection with the ark or associated in some way with it.[4] Thus the authority of the Davidic dynasty is mediated through the symbolism of the ark at Zion.

---

[1] On the bringing of the ark to Zion as a celebration of David's victories over the Philistines and his conquest of Jerusalem as holy war triumphs see chap. 2, §C.

[2] On *môsāb* in the sense of divine throne see Ezek. 28:2. On the verb *yāsab* referring to Yahweh's enthronement in connection with the ark installed in the temple see I Kgs. 8:13 and the discussion chap. 2, §D.

[3] On this translation see D. R. Hillers, "Ritual Procession of the Ark and Ps 132," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XXX (1968), 49-51. Cf. chap. 1, §§A,C.

[4] Fretheim, "Psalm 132," p. 299, regards *^{c}ôy^{e}bāyw* here as an allusion to the words *w^{e}yāpûṣû* *'ôy^{e}beykā* which follow *qûmâ* *yhwh* in the ark chant of Num. 10:35; cf. Ps. 68:2.

The cultic and didactic use of various forms of the ark story is confirmed by a longer poetic recollection of it in Psalm 78:56-72, part of a psalm of uncertain date.[5] The psalm as a whole is a lengthy recital of the traditional *Heilsgeschichte*, stressing Yahweh's wrathful responses to Israel's repeated acts of rebellion and faithlessness.[1] It reaches a climax with Yahweh's rejection of Israel and his dwelling place at Shiloh and his choice of Judah, Zion and David instead (vss. 59-72).[2] The allusion to the ark story is much more clear than in Psalm 132, explicitly summarizing the departure of the ark from Shiloh and its capture by the Philistines (vss. 60-64). In contrast to Psalm 132 there is no hint of David's role in bringing the ark to Jerusalem. Instead, Yahweh himself acting alone as a mighty warrior (*k^{e}gibbôr*) delivers the ark into captivity and then arises as if from a stupor to rout the enemy and to choose Zion and David (vss. 65-66).[3] Almost completely lacking in Psalm 78, as in Psalm 132, is the kind of cosmological imagery that is associated with the ark in the psalms of Yahweh's kingship considered in the previous chapter and in some of the royal psalms to be considered further along in this chapter.[4] The only hint of such imagery is the reference to Yahweh building his sanctuary like the heavens and founding it as permanently as the earth (vs. 69).[1] As in Psalm 132, the election of David and the election of Zion are represented as two distinct but interrelated divine acts, both resting on the coming of the ark. As in Exodus 15:1b-18 and perhaps Psalm 132, the coming of the ark to Zion is also the climax of the *Heilsgeschichte*.[2]

---

[1] In Ps. 78:60 *miškān* refers explicitly to the Shiloh sanctuary. In Jeremiah 7:12 the verb *škn* (piel) referring to Yahweh's name dwelling at Shiloh likewise must refer to the ark. Cf. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 47, 174-175, Fretheim, "Psalm 132," pp. 294-295, and the discussion of the Priestly ark and tabernacle tradition in chap. 1, §G.

[2] See von Rad, "Es ist noch eine Ruhe," p. 105, Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 885, Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 178-179, and Fretheim, "Psalm 132," p. 300. This theme is presented at length in Ps. 78 and Ex. 15:1b-18 and is probably implied in the J stratum of the Pentateuch; cf. *m^{e}nûhâ*, Num. 10:33, and the discussions in chap. 1, §A, and chap. 4, §D.

[3] Ps. 132:11a, *nišba^c-yhwh l^{e}dāwid* / *'^{e}met lô'-yāsûb mimmennâ*; 110:4, *nišba^c yhwh* / *w^{e}lô' yinnāḥēm*; 89:4, *kārattî b^{e}rit libhîrî* / *nišba^{c}tî l^{e}dāwid ^{c}abdî*.

[4] See chap. 2, §E, and below, §B.

[5] On the date and background of Ps. 78 see the opinions cited by Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 540-541, 543, and Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 47, 53-54. Both stress the Deuteronomic characteristics of the psalm as the best clue to its date. But Wright, "The Lawsuit of God," pp. 40-41, has argued cogently for a date early in the monarchic period.

---

[1] On the peculiar features of this particular poetic recital of the *Heilsgeschichte* see von Rad, *Das Formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch*, p. 19, *Theology*, I, 46, 123, 283, 357, and Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 539-548.

[2] On the currency of the theme of the rejection of Shiloh in the late period of the monarchy see Jeremiah 7:12 and 26:6 which presupposes this theme as an accepted tradition. See the discussion of these passages in chap. 8, §C.

[3] On *gibbôr* as a holy war title for Yahweh see *gibbôr* and *gibbôr milḥāmâ* in Ps. 24:8 and the discussion above, chap. 4, §G.

[4] In Ps. 78 the title *^{c}elyôn* for Yahweh occurs in vss. 7,35,56, but without any cosmological overtones in the context.

The allusion to the ark in Psalm 78:60-61 is in terms of Yahweh's holy war power (*^{c}uzzô*) and his theophany presence (*tip'artô*).[3] The preceding chapter on the kingship of Yahweh in the Psalms has shown how these two elements, in combination with Jebusite El Elyon cosmological imagery, gave rise to the picture of Yahweh's heavenly enthronement and universal dominion as the cosmic prototype of Zion as the place of the ark and of Yahweh's earthly presence and power. The other royal psalms to be examined in the remainder of this chapter will show how the holy war and theophany symbolism of the ark contributed to the development of the picture of the victorious dominion of the Davidic king ruling from Zion as the earthly counterpart of Yahweh's cosmic dominion.

---

[1] The words *k^{e}mô-rāmîm* must mean "like the heavens" or something similar whether one retains the text as is or emends it to something like *kimrômim* with *BH*. Most translators regard the antecedent of the feminine singular suffix on *y^{e}sādāh* to be the immediately preceding word *'ereṣ*. However, a more complete synonymous parallelism would result if *har siyyôn* and *miqdāšô* in the preceding two half lines were regarded as the synonymous antecedents. The feminine gender of the suffix would result from attraction to the feminine gender of *siyyôn* strengthened by the attraction of the feminine gender of *'ereṣ* as the point of comparison; cf. Is. 14:32, *yhwh yissad siyyôn*, and Is. 28:16, *hin^{e}nî m^{e}yassēd* (IQIs^{a}) *b^{e}ṣiyyôn 'eben*. Of course *ysd* qal is used regularly to refer to Yahweh establishing the earth or its foundations, Pss. 24:2; 89:12; 102:26; 104:5; Prov. 3:19; Job 38:4; Is. 48:13; 51:13,16; Zech. 12:1. This is evidently the source of the imagery in Ps. 78:69.

[2] See chap. 4, §D.

[3] Cf. chap. 1, §C.

B. The Ark at Zion and the Davidic Empire Theology in Psalm 110

Psalm 110 is of special importance both because of its widely acknowledged antiquity and because of the interrelated allusions it makes to Zion, the ark, holy war, pre-Davidic Jerusalem traditions, and the Davidic dynasty. Along with Psalms 18, 29 and 68 it is likely one of the earliest psalms in the Psalter dating quite possibly to the united monarchy.[1] Whatever the cultic setting of the psalm, the allusion to Melchizedek (vs. 4) must reflect a ritual act instituted in the time of David. The subsequent discussion will show that the triumphant character of the entire psalm is best understood against the background of David's conquests.

The structure of Psalm 110 centers around two oracles addressed to the king, both formally introduced as oracles of Yahweh (vss. 1 and 4). According to the oracle in verse 1, the Davidic king is enthroned at the right hand of Yahweh.[2]

---

[1] The strongest evidence for dating Ps. 110 to the earliest period of the monarchy is the explicit reference to the Jebusite Melchizedek tradition (vs. 4; cf. Gen. 14:17-24) and the obscure Canaanite mythical language concerning the king (vs. 3). On the plausibility of such an early date see H. H. Rowley, "Melchizedek and Zadok (Gen 14 and Ps 110)," *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet*, pp. 466-469, Schmid, "Kulttraditionen," pp. 175-176, note 42, Mowinckel, *Psalms*, II, 153, Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 755-756. Whatever the date of composition, the traditional background of the psalm must be David's victorious appropriation of pre-Israelite Jerusalem traditions; cf. G. W. Anderson, "The Psalms," *PCB*, §382d. The attempt of Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, p. 630, to find an acrostic *šm^{c}n* on Simon Maccabeus depends on a dubious reconstruction of the poetic lines and has been refuted numerous times; cf. Oesterley, *Psalms*, p. 461, Mowinckel, *Psalms*, II, 257, 261, and E. A. Leslie, *The Psalms* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1949), p. 103.

[2] On this see Mowinckel, *Psalms*, I, 54, 63-64, 125.

n^{e}’um *yhwh* *la’dônî* / *šēb* *lîmînî*
^{c}ad-’āšît *’ôy^{e}beykā* / *h^{a}dôm* *l^{e}ragleykā*

This represents above all the assurance that Yahweh will place the enemies of the king in subjection to him. Thus the king rules as Yahweh's designated representative, his authority dependent upon the promised holy war victories of Yahweh. The picture of the Davidic king enthroned at Yahweh's right hand points to the ark and cherubim as the symbol of Yahweh's enthronement. The possible antiquity of the psalm is such that the oracle could have originated in the ceremonial installation of David as king in Zion in connection with the installation of the ark as the climactic event of his conquest of Jerusalem.[1] Or it could be an oracle delivered for the installation of some subsequent king or for an annual ceremony renewing David's kingship.[2] It could even be an oracle originally delivered before a battle or military campaign and later incorporated into the psalm. Whatever its origin, the oracle seems to make the imperial authority of the king symbolically dependent upon the ark as the traditional cultic embodiment of Yahweh's holy war power.[1]

---

[1] In Ps. 132:11-12 a dynastic oracle is repeated in close connection with the recital of the tradition of the installation of the ark in Zion. Cf. Ps. 78:65-72. Mowinckel, *Psalms*, I, 63-64, and II, 61, 132, 153, assumes that Ps. 110 was used in connection with the anointing of the king at Zion and that it therefore cannot be older than the installation of Solomon. Actually, however, this psalm makes no allusion to anointing.

[2] Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, pp. 104, 118-126, assumes that this and other royal psalms were connected with the feast of tabernacles and that they formed part of an annual cultic drama celebrating the kingship of Yahweh. But Ps. 110 gives no hint of a ceremony of Yahweh's enthronement; cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 756. For two attempts to reconstruct the ritual for the installation of the Davidic kings see de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 100-107, and Kraus, *Worship*, pp. 222-224.

This is further evident in the promises and exhortation in verses 2-3a addressed to the king by the prophet, apparently as an interpretative supplement to the oracle:

> *maṭṭēh* *^{c}uzz^{e}kā* *yišlaḥ* *yhwh*
> *miṣṣiyyôn* *r^{e}dēh* *b^{e}qereb* *ʼôy^{e}beykā*
> *^{c}amm^{e}kā* *n^{e}dābôt* *b^{e}yôm* *hêlekā*[2]

The use of the term *^{c}ōz* referring to the holy war power of Yahweh associated cultically with the ark indicates that *maṭṭeh-^{c}uzz^{e}kā* represents this same power bestowed symbolically upon the king as Yahweh's chosen instrument of victory and dominion.[3] Yet, even with this bestowal of divine power, the king remains completely dependent on Yahweh's victorious might. Thus Yahweh's power symbolized by the ark issues forth from Zion through the instrumentality of the king. There is no hint that the ark itself goes into battle, though in the light of II Samuel 11:11 this possibility cannot be entirely ruled out.[1]

---

[1] On this point see especially the remarks of Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 757-758, who also cites a number of ancient Near Eastern parallels to the symbolism of the king sitting at the right hand of the deity; cf. Mowinckel, *Psalms*, I, 54-55.

[2] The word *miṣṣiyyôn* is usually taken with the preceding stich. However the division adopted here yields a rhythmically balanced 4 + 4 + 4 structure though without parallelism. The meaning is not significantly different in either case. Textual difficulties occur only in the last line, v. 3a, which the traditional verse division and some modern interpreters would connect with the rest of vs. 3 rather than vs. 2. The word *ndbt* is somewhat obscure whether one reads *^{c}amm^{e}kā*, "your people," following the MT, or *^{c}imm^{e}kā*, "with you," following the LXX. In any case the phrase seems to allude to preparation for battle. The word *hêlekā* is better taken as a reference to the king's might manifest in battle rather than as an infinitive of *ḥwl/ḥyl* in parallelism with *yldtyk*. The latter suggestion increases the difficulty of *^{c}mk* *ndbt*.

[3] See chap. 1, §C, chap. 2, §D, and above, §A.

Psalm 110 is probably the earliest extant psalm in which the word Zion occurs, whether or not it is as old as David or Solomon.[2] It may therefore offer the best available clue to the earliest connotations of the word as a religious symbol in the Yahwistic cult at Jerusalem. In order to understand the continuing preference for this term in cultic poetry one must assume that already in the time of David it had acquired distinctive religious overtones in the language of the cult. This is the best way to explain the changes in its topographical reference which occurred after the time of David. As already shown, it referred originally to the fortified area on the southeast hill which was renamed City of David.[3] Later it came instead to be used in a more vague way either to refer primarily to the temple hill or else as a topographical synonym of Jerusalem. Yet at the same time it gradually gained independent significance as a theological symbol. This points to the conclusion that the cultic meaning Zion had already acquired in the time of David was transferred along with the ark when this was installed in the temple of Solomon. Thus, in its earliest traceable religious and cultic connotation, Zion was the place of the ark and the center from which Yahweh's holy war might and imperial authority were manifest through the victories and dominion of the Davidic king.[4]

---

[1] Cf. chap. 2, §B.

[2] See chap. 3, §C, for the pre-exilic occurrences of Zion in the Psalms.

[3] Chap. 3, §B.

[4] Cf. Pedersen, Israel, III-IV, 431.

No clear and explicit cosmological significance is ascribed to Zion in Psalm 110. Nevertheless the imagery of Yahweh enthroned in connection with the ark, assigning a seat of honor to the king, reflects the traditional picture of Yahweh attended by subordinate semidivine beings. Thus, by implication, the Davidic king is assigned a chief place of honor and authority in Yahweh's heavenly court or, perhaps more correctly, in the earthly counterpart of Yahweh's heavenly court at Zion.[1] This interpretation is somewhat conjectural but is supported by the pictures of Yahweh as head of the pantheon associated with the ark in the psalms of Yahweh's kingship.[2] The traditional Canaanite picture of the high god El or Elyon assigning spheres of authority to the subordinate deities is thus the source of the imagery of Psalm 110:1-2.[3] But in Psalm 110 the imagery is modified in terms of the holy war symbolism of the ark. The king sitting at Yahweh's right hand rules from Zion by virtue of Yahweh's holy war victories, not as a subordinate deity.

The remainder of Psalm 110 supports this interpretation. An obscure oracle in verse 3 seems to represent the king's relationship to Yahweh in more explicitly mythological terms. According to one possible reconstruction of the difficult text this oracle reads:

---

[1] Similarly Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 759. The same imagery is probably also present in Ps. 2 as pointed out in the next section.

[2] See especially the discussion of Ps. 68:18 and the comparison with Deut. 33:2-3 in chap. 4, §A. In these pictures of Yahweh's holy war intervention he seems to be accompanied by "chariot myriads" or a "myriad of holy ones." To the expression *šēb lîmînî* in Ps. 110:1 compare *kōl-q^{e}dôšîm b^{e}yādekā* in Deut. 33:2 as emended with the LXX.

[3] On this imagery see the discussion in chap. 4, §D, of the term *naḥ^{a}lâ* in Ex. 15:17, Deut. 32:8-9, and the Ugaritic comparative materials.

b^{e}har^{e}rê-qōdeš / *mēreḥem šaḥar* / *k^{e}ṭal y^{e}lidtîkā*

"In holy mountains,
from the womb of Dawn,
like dew I have begotten you."[1]

It is either a resumption of the oracle in verse 1, or an older oracle quoted at this point to enhance further the imagery depicting the king's relation to Yahweh.[2] The words *mēreḥem šaḥar* ... *y^{e}lidtîkā* must be compared with the fragmentary myth concerning *hêlēl ben-šaḥar* in Isaiah 14: 12-15. According to this myth *hêlēl ben-šaḥar* is apparently a subordinate deity who attempts to usurp the place of the high god Elyon on the cosmic world mountain (vss. 13-14) and who is then cast down to the underworld (vs. 15). This is clearly an astral myth in origin, referring to the rising of the morning star and its disappearance before the rising of the sun. The term *yarkᵉtê ṣāpôn* (vs. 13) referring to the cosmic world mountain also connects this myth with the sacred mountain of Baal in the Ugaritic texts.[1] The oracle in Psalm 110:3 can hardly refer to this particular mythological incident since the theme of Psalm 110:3 is not the overthrow of *hêlēl ben-šaḥar* but rather the marvellous birth of possibly this same deity, perhaps as the son of Elyon and the dawn goddess Shahar.[2] But the cosmic setting is similar. The term *bᵉharᵉrê-qōdeš*, if this is the original reading, probably refers to the world mountain of the gods as the setting of this event.[3] The phrase *kᵉṭal*, appropriately associated with the dawn, perhaps points to the original fertility symbolism of the myth.[4] But there are no comparative materials similar enough to permit a reconstruction of the myth.[5] The very obscurity of the allusion in Psalm 110:3, together with the lack of comparative material in the Old Testament, indicates that the picture of the divine birth of the king does not imply a full-fledged mythological concept of kingship. In context it simply enhances with another image the theme of the king's dependence on Yahweh as symbolized by the preceding picture of his enthronement at Yahweh's right hand.

---

[1] This is the reconstruction of the text adopted by Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 752-753. The textual variants together with the general obscurity of the verse render any reconstruction very uncertain. Indeed one could write a lengthy paper just collecting and comparing the many textual reconstructions and translations of vs. 3 that have been put forward by various interpreters. The reading *b^{e}har^{e}rê* is attested in many mss. MT and in the versions of Symmachus and Jerome (cf. *BH*). It is little if any more probable than *b^{e}hadrê*, attested in other mss. MT including ms. L, and in the LXX and Vulg. The reading *šaḥar* for *mišhār* is a plausible conjecture which gives a more intelligible meaning. The *m* may be regarded as dittography or perhaps as an enclitic *m* which has become superfluous. The emendation of *lk ṭl* to *kṭl* is a conjecture made necessary when *yldtyk* is read as a verb. The omission of *lk ṭl* with the LXX would give a much smoother reading. But this leaves no plausible way to explain the presence of the words in the MT. The vocalization of *yldtyk* as a verb, attested by many mss. MT, the LXX, Peshitta and Hebrew text of Origen (cf. *BH*), seems much more likely in the light of Ps. 2:7. The vocalization as a noun attested in MT ms. L and fragment Ec 17 of a ms. with Babylonian pointing (cf. *BH*) may be regarded as an attempt to render the preceding words *lk ṭl* more intelligible.

[2] Note that in Ps. 2:6-7 the same two pictures of Yahweh establishing the authority of the king in Zion and of him begetting the king also occur side by side but in two separate oracles.

---

[1] For a fuller discussion of Is. 14:12-15 and the Ugaritic comparative material see chap. 6, §B.

[2] The evidence of Is. 14:12 goes against the argument cited by Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, p. 62, on the basis of an Assyrian text, that the reference is to the birth of the sun god.

[3] So Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 759. See the discussion of the expression *har qodšî* in Ps. 2:7 in the next section.

[4] Cf. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, p. 75.

[5] Mythical allusions to *šaḥar* may also occur in Job 3:9 and 41:18 and Ps. 139:9 but in such vague terms as to be of no help. The Ugaritic myth of the birth of the gods *šḥr* and *šlm* to *il*, *UM*, 52:52-53, is clearly a different myth; cf. the discussion and translation in G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Old Testament Studies, 3; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956), pp. 22-23, 121-124.

In the light of the undeniable allusion to a pre-Davidic Jerusalem tradition in the oracle in verse 4 one may conjecture plausibly that the oracle quoted in verse 3 derives from a Jebusite kingship ritual or tradition and is quoted here because this office has been taken over by David. As a further possibility, the expression *b^{e}har^{e}rê-qōdeš*, referring to the cosmic mountain of the gods in Jebusite mythology, may have had Zion as its earthly counterpart.[1] But one may not safely draw firm conclusions from such slender evidence, especially since the reading *b^{e}har^{e}rê* is itself in great doubt textually.

The second pivotal oracle, Psalm 110:4, is introduced by an emphatic oath formula:

nišba^{c} *yhwh* / *w^{e}lô'* *yinnāḥēm*
'attâ *kôhēn* *l^{ec}ôlām* / *^{c}al-dibrātî* *malkî-ṣedeq*

The existence of a prophetic office associated with the ark was argued in connection with I Samuel 3.[2] That dynastic oracles were delivered in close symbolic connection with the ark has been noted in II Samuel 7 and Psalm 132.[3] This confirms the evidence of verse 1 that the oracles addressed to the king in Psalm 110 were also delivered by a cultic prophet associated with the ark. While such prophets may have become less charismatic in character, they continued to invoke Yahweh's holy war intervention on behalf of the king and to confirm the king in his dynastic office and in his unique relationship to Yahweh.[1]

---

[1] The expressions *b^{e}har^{e}rê-qōdeš* in connection with *ša^{ca}rê-ṣiyyôn* in Ps. 87:1-2 and the reference to the dew of Hermon falling *^{c}al-har^{e}rê ṣiyyôn* in Ps. 133:3 might be other faint recollections of such a correlation. See also the reference to *ṣiyyôn* as *'addir* *mēhar^{e}rê-^{c}ad* in Ps. 76:5 (emending MT *terep* to *^{c}ad* on the basis of the LXX and the fact that another word *^{c}ad* is a synonym of *ṭerep* which is unintelligible here), and the pairing of the two cosmological opposites *har^{e}rê-'ēl* and *t^{e}hôm* *rabbâ* in Ps. 36:7; cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 524.

[2] See chap. 1, §C.

[3] See chap. 2, §E, and above, §A.

Rowley has argued that the first oracle (vs. 1) was addressed by Melchizedek = Zadok, the Jebusite priest, to David confirming him as king of Jerusalem; the second oracle (vs. 4) was spoken by David confirming Zadok in his priestly office and placing him in charge of the ark installed in the Jebusite temple.[2] But, the only concrete evidence for identifying David's priest Zadok with the Melchizedek of Psalm 110:4 and Genesis 14:17-24 is the element _sdq_ in the two names. The strong emphasis on holy war throughout the psalm makes it more likely that in both oracles a Yahwistic prophet associated with the ark is confirming David's claim to the Jebusite priestly and royal office of Melchizedek as a fruit of David's divinely given victory over the Jebusites. The evidence is strong that David established a tent sanctuary especially for the ark modeled after the ark sanctuary at Shiloh. This can hardly be harmonized with Rowley's assumption that the ark was installed in a previously existing Jebusite temple.[1]

---

[1] C. Westermann, _Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech_, tr. H. C. White (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967), pp. 120-128, 157-158, argues on the basis of form-critical comparisons of prophetic messages preserved in the book of Kings and prophet-like messages recorded in some of the Mari letters that prophecy was associated especially with the royal court in the early monarchy. He also suggests less clearly that salvation prophecy was rooted in the proclamation of victory in holy war. He does not notice the connections with the ark.

[2] H. H. Rowley, "Zadok and Nehushtan," _JBL_, LVIII (1939), 113-132, and "Melchizedek and Zadok," pp. 461-472.

The fragmentary character of the Jebusite cultic themes and traditions preserved in the Old Testament indicates that they were assimilated in a less direct and less wholesale way than Rowley and many other interpreters have assumed. A more plausible assumption is that the Jebusite populace of Jerusalem and the new Israelite and Judean ruling class which settled in Jerusalem under David were gradually assimilated to one another. Since there is no evidence that David practiced the ḥērem against the Jebusite populace or that they resisted him after his initial victory, it is probable that this assimilation took place rather easily, perhaps facilitated by the already heterogeneous ethnic composition of David's entourage. If there was an educated Jebusite aristocracy from which David staffed his governmental and religious establishment, this would have facilitated the assimilation of Canaanite court rituals and associated mythological imagery without a wholesale taking over of Jebusite cultic practices.

The Yahwistic cult associated with the ark was certainly the dominant religious factor in this process, so much so that the only non-Yahwistic cults in Israelite Jerusalem dating from the time of the united monarchy recorded in the Old Testament are the foreign importations attributed to Solomon. Under David the Yahwistic ark cult seems completely dominant. The Yahwism of his reign was triumphant and confident. David's victories were regarded as Yahweh's victories. Whatever Jebusite cults survived must have dwindled away into relative obscurity or have been displaced by the ark cult. The Jebusite populace must have become ready converts to Yahwism just as many Israelites in times of foreign domination later on became easy converts to Assyrian or other non-Israelite cults. The title Elyon or El Elyon of the pre-Davidic Jebusite high god and the mythological imagery associated with him could be applied to Yahweh to enhance the picture of his cosmic power without turning him into a typical Canaanite nature and fertility god.

---

[1] See chap. 2, §C; cf. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, pp. 310-311, 373-374.

The closing verses, Psalm 110:5-7, appear to be the prophet's own words of assurance interpreting the oracle of verse 4. Despite many textual uncertainties these verses clearly reveal an exalted, triumphant confidence in Yahweh's power acting on behalf of the king, even though some of the archaic and obscure imagery may be Canaanite in origin just as in the oracle in verse 3. The expression *māḥaṣ* or *māḥaṣ rô’š* in particular (vss. 5 and 6) is often used in archaic poetic passages of various kinds picturing Yahweh's holy war exploits against Israel's enemies.[1] The words *b^{e}yôm ’appô*, *m^{e}lākîm* and *^{c}al-’ereṣ rabbâ* may be compared with *malkê-’ereṣ* and *’āz y^{e}dabbēr ’ēlêmô b^{e}’appô*, Psalm 2:2,5, where the universality of Yahweh's dominion exercised through the instrumentality of the Davidic king is strongly emphasized.

C. Zion and the Davidic Empire Theology in Psalm 2

Psalm 2, which is closely related to Psalm 110, expresses throughout the same exalted confidence in Yahweh and the Davidic king. In fact it voices a theology of empire fully intelligible only against the background of the empire built by David.[1] Whether or not the psalm in its present form dates from a time as early as the united monarchy, the underlying themes and cultic actions may be best understood against that background.[2] The king is certainly the speaker in verses 7-9, and probably throughout the entire psalm.

---

[1] Pss. 68:21; 18:39 = II Sam. 22:39; Deut. 32:39; 33:11; Hab. 3:13; cf. Jud. 5:26; Num. 24:8,17. Cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 761-762.

The two oracles around which the psalm is built may be older than the context into which they have been incorporated. The first (vs. 6) is spoken in third person style about the king:

wa'^{a}nî *nāsaktî* *malkî* / *^{c}al-ṣiyyôn* *har-qodšî*[3]

It must have been spoken originally in connection with the installation of a Davidic king in Zion. But in the present context the introductory formula (vss. 4-5) addresses it as a word of doom to nations and kings whose rebellion has been portrayed at the beginning of the psalm (vss.

---

[1] See especially the remarks of Alt, "Das Grossreich Davids," p. 75, who argues that the so-called *Hofstil* of this psalm reflects the historical reality of David's empire which continued to be held as an ideal in connection with the Davidic dynasty long after the disintegration of the empire. Similarly, Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 15; cf. Pedersen, *Israel*, III-IV, 432.

[2] The infrequent form *-mô* of the third person masculine plural pronominal suffix which occurs repeatedly in Ps. 2 need not be regarded as an artificial archaism with *GK* §91L but may be a genuine indication of antiquity as also in Ex. 15:1b-18; cf. Cross and Freedman, "The Song of Miriam," p. 245, note 10. Mowinckel, *Psalms*, pp. 62-63, Weiser, *Psalms*, p. 109, Ringgren, *Israelite Religion*, pp. 223-225, Dahood, *Psalms 1-50*, and perhaps the majority of interpreters connect the entire psalm with the installation of a new king. But Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, p. 119, believes it reflects part of an annual new year ceremony of renewal. Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 13-14, and Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 108, regard either option as possible.

[3] The word *nskty* is somewhat obscure but probably alludes to some sort of installation or consecration ceremony. In any case it is better to treat it as qal from a root *nsk* with the MT rather than reading it as niphal with the LXX; cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 12.

1-3). The second oracle (vss. 7b-9) is addressed in first person style to the king. According to the two introductory statements, *’^{a}sapp^{e}râ ’el ḥōq yhwh* and *’āmar ’ēlay*, which incorporate it into the context, it is being quoted by the king (vs. 7a). The second oracle may also contain an original nucleus (vs. 7b) spoken in connection with the installation of a Davidic king:

b^{e}nî ’attâ / ’^{a}nî hayyôm y^{e}lidtîkā

The remainder of the oracle (vss. 8-9), which confers world dominion upon the Davidic king, may represent an interpretative expansion of the primary oracle. Despite these possible indications of composition, the entire psalm presents a notable thematic unity drawing out the implications of the two primary oracles of verses 6 and 7. There are no identifiable allusions to the ark in the psalm. But the points of contact between this psalm and Psalms 110 and 132 make it probable not only that the oracles were delivered by a prophetic spokesman in connection with the ark, but that the entire psalm was associated cultically with the ark.

As in Psalm 110, the oracle installing the king at Zion (Ps. 2:6; cf. 110:1-2) and the oracle proclaiming his divine sonship (Ps. 2:7; cf. 110:3) are adjacent to one another and yet distinct from one another. On the basis of Psalm 110:1-2 we may infer that the oracle in Psalm 2:6 installing the king in Zion likewise reflects cultic symbolism associated with the ark. But, in contrast to Psalm 110:1, Psalm 2:6 does not allude to the ark as the symbol of the king's dependence on the holy war power of Yahweh. Instead, Zion as Yahweh's *har qōdeš* is itself the center and symbol of authority and victorious power conferred upon the king. The significance of Zion is thus essentially the same here as in Psalm 110:2. There, however, Zion is spoken of only in the interpretative supplement to the oracle seating the king at Yahweh's right hand in connection with the ark. In Psalm 2:6 Zion itself has become the symbolic focal point of Yahweh's action. This confirms a suggestion in the previous chapter that the symbolism of the ark tended to be transferred to Zion itself.[1]

The context in which the oracle of Psalm 2:6 is quoted confirms another inference drawn from Psalm 110:1-2. The cosmological imagery of the high god assigning positions of authority to subordinate beings in his heavenly court is used in a modified and demythologized form to depict Yahweh installing the Davidic king at Zion. In Psalm 2:1-7, taken as a whole, Yahweh who is in heaven (vs. 4) delegates authority over the nations of the earth to the king who is on Zion. Thus the king reigning at Zion is the earthly instrument and counterpart of Yahweh's universal dominion. This dominion is portrayed in warlike terms as the suppression of a conspiracy on the part of the nations and kings of the earth to rebel against Yahweh and his anointed king.[2]

The expression *har-qodšî* may itself have carried cosmic and mythological overtones of Canaanite origin in connection with kingship. In a fragmentary myth preserved in Ezekiel 28:12-19 the term *har* *qōdeš* *ʾᵉlôhîm* (vs. 14) appears to be a synonym of *ᶜēden* *gan-ʾᵉlôhîm* (vs. 13) referring to the cosmic world mountain where the king of Tyre is said to have been installed as *kᵉrûb mimšah* by the high god.[1] In the messianic oracle of Isaiah 11:1-9 *kol-har qodšî* (vs. 9) appears to refer to the world as Yahweh's sacred mountain ruled by the Davidic King. In Isaiah 65:17-25, the same poetic picture (vs. 25) seems to refer more specifically to the new Jerusalem as the center of the eschatological new universe which Yahweh promises to create. Mythological or cosmological overtones may also be present in the term *har qodšô* in Psalm 48:2 where it occurs in synonymous parallelism with *har-ṣiyyôn* in a series of laudatory titles, and in Psalm 99:9 where it occurs as a poetic synonym for *hᵃdôm raglāyw* (vs. 5), alluding to the ark or Zion itself as the symbol of Yahweh's cosmic dominion.[2] But in Psalm 2:6 the cosmological significance of *har-qodšî* has receded into the background. It is instead a partially demythologized symbol of the divinely given authority of the Davidic king. Zion and the Davidic king are together the earthly counterpart and manifestation of the heavenly cosmic power of Yahweh.

---

[1] See chap. 4, §F.

[2] Vs. 2c, *ᶜal-yhwh* *wᵉᶜal-mᵉšîḥô*, is often regarded as an explanatory addition; cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 11-13. However, such a deletion can be made only on grounds of poetic structure. The thought fits perfectly with the context.

In the second oracle (vss. 7-9) mythological imagery is more clear than anywhere else in the psalm. However the designation of the king as Yahweh's son, *bᵉnî ʼattâ*, is actually a formula of adoption which minimizes the mythological connotations of *yᵉlidtîkā* that were apparent in

---

[1] Cf. A. Bentzen, *King and Messiah* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1955), p. 18. For a fuller discussion of Ezek. 28:11-19 see chap. 6, §B.

[2] On Ps. 48:2 see the full discussion in chap. 6. On Ps. 99:9 see chap. 4, §F. The term *har-qodšî* and variants such as *har-qodšᵉkā* and *har-qodšô* occur approximately 15 more times in the Psalms, late strata of Isaiah and other exilic and postexilic prophetic passages. In all these cases it refers to Jerusalem and the temple area, but without any discernible cosmological connotations, indicating that it was eventually completely demythologized into a designation of the sacred area of the temple.

Psalm 110:3.[1] The continuation or expansion of the oracle promising world dominion to the Davidic king reflects even more clearly the mythological imagery of the high god assigning a *naḥ^{a}lâ* to a subordinate deity (vs. 8).[2] But the mythological content is again minimized by the synonymous parallel *'^{a}ḥuzzâ* which appears simply to mean "possession." The closing lines imply that the rebellious kings should be reduced to submission by fear and awe at the manifestation of Yahweh's wrath (vss. 10-11). So, as in Psalm 110, the dominion of the Davidic king depends upon the victorious power of Yahweh acting from heaven. But this power has its earthly focal point at Zion, Yahweh's holy mountain, where the king is installed in connection with the ark.

D. The King and the Holy War Theophany Symbolism of the Ark in Psalm 18

More clearly than any of the other royal psalms, Psalm 18 = II Samuel 22 reflects themes deriving from the premonarchic holy war and hymnic theophany traditions. Recent discussion of this psalm has stressed its archaic linguistic and religious features which make probable a date early in the monarchy.[3] Although this psalm does not use the word

---

[1] Cf. II Sam. 7:14; Ps. 89:27-28 and the discussions in Noth, "Gott, König, Volk," pp. 222-223, de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 111-113, Weiser, *Psalms*, pp. 113-114, and Mowinckel, *Psalms*, I, 54.

[2] On the mythological connotation of *naḥ^{a}lâ* see above, chap. 4, §D.

[3] See especially the orthographic and linguistic evidence presented by Cross and Freedman, "A Royal Psalm of Thanksgiving," pp. 15-34. They attempt to reconstruct the text of the psalm in terms of the orthography of the Northern Kingdom in the ninth-eighth centuries, remnants of which they find in II Sam. 22. The possibility of a date as early as David or Solomon for the main portion of the psalm is accepted by Weiser, *Psalms*, pp. 185-186, Hertzberg, *Samuel*, pp. 392-393, and even in the somewhat

Zion, it illustrates vividly the theme of divine victory granted to the king associated with the theophany symbolism of the ark and cherubim in the Jerusalem sanctuary.

In form, Psalm 18 is a psalm of thanksgiving for the use of the king in celebrating divinely given victory and dominion.[1] Composed primarily in first person singular style, it alternates between second person addresses to Yahweh and third person statements of Yahweh's deeds. Its structure is rather complex, showing evidence of dependence on older poetic passages and themes probably derived from oral tradition sources as in the case of Psalm 68.[2] Nevertheless, the psalm as a whole displays such clear thematic progression and development that it may be regarded in the main as a unified composition drawing upon traditional poetic themes and materials.[3]

The first major section of the psalm, verses 4-20, presents a

---

older commentary by Oesterley, Psalms, p. 162. Kraus, Psalmen, I, 141-142, 147, acknowledges the possibility of such an early date but remains noncommital.

[1] This is assumed by most recent interpreters such as Kraus, Psalmen, I, 140-141, Weiser, Psalms, p. 185, and especially by Mowinckel, Psalms, I, 48, 236, and II, 18, 100.

[2] See chap. 4, §A. Cross and Freedman, "A Royal Psalm of Thanksgiving," pp. 21, 24-26, 28, note vss. 8-16 and the gnomic couplet in vss. 26-27 as the most obvious examples of such dependence. Partial parallels of the kind which may indicate dependence on common oral traditions occur frequently, for example vss. 31 (cf. Deut. 32:4; Prov. 30:5), 33-34 (cf. Hab. 3:19; Job 9:8; Deut. 33:29c), 38a (cf. Ex. 15a), 41a (cf. Ex. 23:27b), 48b (cf. Ps. 48:4a). The many parallels in Ps. 144 are probably to be explained by dependence of some kind upon Ps. 18; cf. Kraus, Psalmen, II, 942, and Weiser, Psalms, pp. 823-824.

[3] For a refutation of the view that vss. 2-31 and 32-51 constitute two separate psalms see Kraus, Psalmen, I, 140.

retrospective recital of the king's appeal for deliverance from the enemy and of Yahweh's victorious intervention. The appeal uses conventional semimythical cosmological imagery, requesting divine intervention from heaven to deliver the king from the clutches of death represented by the chaos waters of the underworld (vss. 5-6,17).[1] The king's cry for help, heard by Yahweh mēhêkālô (vs. 7), must have taken place in connection with the ark.[2] At the same time the temple is probably thought of as the earthly representation of Yahweh's heavenly palace as in the psalms of Yahweh's kingship.[3]

Yahweh's victorious intervention in response to the appeal is depicted in terms of a magnificent theophany description (vss. 8-16). Jeremias argues that this theophany passage represents a block of material of independent oral tradition origin and composition incorporated into Psalm 18 with little or no modification.[4] He thinks the theophany passage and its original Sitz im Leben had no direct or inner connection with the rest of the psalm and its Sitz im Leben. Because he does not notice the role of the ark in the cultic Sitz im Leben of the lament recalled in Psalm 18 or the theophany symbolism associated with the cherubim, he cannot explain how the theophany Gattung spread from its original premonarchic connection with victory songs such as the Song of Deborah, composed for the celebration of holy war victories, to other poetic contexts and Gattungen such as hymns, laments and thanksgivings.[1] The most plausible hypothesis is that the holy war and theophany symbolism of the ark and cherubim were central elements in the cultic establishments of David and Solomon. Traditional theophany and holy war language and imagery could thus be assimilated easily into a variety of different cultic functions and into cultic poetry associated with Zion, the temple and the Davidic dynasty.

---

[1] Similar stereotyped references to death and Sheol occur often in descriptions of distress in individual laments. See especially Jonah 2:3-7; Is. 38:10-12,18; and Ps. 88:4-19, and the comments of Kraus, Psalmen, I, 142-143 and II, 608-610. For general accounts of Israelite conceptions of death see von Rad, Theology, I, 387-391, Ringgren, Israelite Religion, pp. 239-247, and the sources cited by them.

[2] See the story of Hezekiah's lament before the ark, II Kgs. 19:14-19 = Is. 37:14-20, and the communal lament, Ps. 80, addressed to the ark and cherubim as the symbol of Yahweh's presence and victorious theophany intervention (vs. 2). Cf. chap. 2, §D, and chap. 4, §G.

[3] See especially the discussion of Pss. 29, 93, 96 and 98 in chap. 4, §F. This interpretation makes it unnecessary to restrict the meaning of mēhêkālô to one or the other alternative as is done for example by Kraus, Psalmen, I, 143, who restricts the meaning to the Jerusalem temple, or Cross and Freedman, "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving," p. 23, who restrict the meaning to Yahweh's heavenly abode.

[4] Theophanie, pp. 2-5, 33-36, 128-129.

Jeremias suggests that the title "prophetess" applied to Deborah (Jud. 4:4) and Miriam (Ex. 15:20) is evidence that holy war victory songs such as Judges 5 and Exodus 15:21 were composed and sung by ecstatics.[2] In fact he seems to regard this as the original Sitz im Leben of the hymnic theophany Gattung. This suggestion may be expanded by connecting it with evidence already presented that charismatic prophet-like figures were associated with the ark and communicated oracles and instructions of various kinds in connection with it including the invocation or proclamation of Yahweh's holy war intervention.[1] The theophany passage in Psalm 18:8-16 may thus reflect a stereotyped oracle delivered originally in connection with the ark in response to the king's appeal for divine intervention.[2]

---

[1] Jeremias, Theophanie, pp. 158-164; cf. chap. 1, §§C,E, and chap. 2, §D.

[2] Ibid., pp. 149-150. In support of this he cites Noth, Exodus, p. 123.

This is the most comprehensive and fully developed theophany description in the entire Psalter, bringing together many traditional elements such as cosmic upheaval indicated by the quaking of the earth and its underworld foundations, and Yahweh's descent from heaven portrayed in dramatic thunderstorm imagery. As already shown, such Canaanite imagery was already assimilated in premonarchic times to the Israelite holy war hymnic theophany tradition and was symbolized in the Shiloh cult by cherubim figures associated with the ark, a combination later established by David and Solomon as the central symbol of the Yahwistic cult at Jerusalem.[3] Since Psalm 18 is clearly connected with the temple at Jerusalem, the line, *wayyirkab* *^{c}al-k^{e}rûb* *wayyā^{c}ōp* / *wayyēdeʾ* *^{c}al-kanpê-rûah* (vs. 11), must certainly have been understood in connection with the cherubim in the inner sanctuary.[4] Storm theophany imagery is combined with the

---

[1] See chap. 1, §§B,C,G, chap. 2, §§A,E, and chap. 4, §C.

[2] Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 148, finds allusions to an oracle of deliverance received in the midst of battle in the words *ʾimrat-yhwh* (vs. 31) and *wa^{ca}nôt^{e}kā* (vs. 36, following the reading of II Sam. 22).

[3] See Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 143-145, and Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 33-38, for helpful analyses of this passage and many cross references to other theophany passages. See for example Jud. 5:4-5; Pss. 29:3-9; 68:9; 97:2-5; 99:1; 104:3b-4; Ezek. 1:4-14; Is. 63:19. Cf. Jeremias, pp. 85-90, and the discussions above, chap. 1, §§D-G, chap. 2, §§C-D, chap. 4, §A.

[4] Indeed *k^{e}rûb* is read as plural by the LXX and Vulg., a reading accepted by Cross and Freedman, "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving," p. 24;

Jebusite picture of the high god Elyon whose cosmic power subdues the chaos waters of the underworld (vss. 14,16).[1] In contrast to the view that the theophany passage of verses 8-16 entirely interrupts the context, this climactic picture of Yahweh subduing the chaos waters of the underworld fits well with the imagery in verse 17 of Yahweh reaching down from on high to rescue the king mimmayim rabbîm. This exalted picture of Yahweh's cosmic power and theophany intervention is used primarily to depict in the most awesome terms conceivable the victorious action of Yahweh on behalf of the king, as evident in the closing lines of the king's retrospective recital (vss. 18-20).

That these lines refer to deliverance and victory in battle is even more obvious in the second half of the psalm which offers a second retrospective hymnlike recital of Yahweh's action on behalf of the king (vss. 32-49).[2] The king's skill and prowess as a warrior is a divine charisma which prompts the king to praise Yahweh (vss. 33-37). The defeat and destruction of the enemy is a holy war victory accomplished by Yahweh through the instrumentality of the Davidic king (vss. 38-43). In this respect, the conception of Yahweh's mode of intervention differs from the traditional holy war stories stemming from the premonarchic period which represent his action primarily as a numinous panic visited upon the

---

for similar expressions see Pss. 68:5,34; 104:3; Deut. 33:26, and the discussion in chap. 1, §E. See also Ps. 99:1 which combines the picture of Yahweh enthroned on the cherubim with a theophany-like quaking of the earth.

[1] Cf. Pss. 29:10; 93:3-4; 104:6-7, and the discussion above chap. 4, §F.

[2] Von Rad, Heilige Krieg, p. 82, notes that holy war motifs occur especially in the royal psalms such as Pss. 18, 20, 21, 144. However he does not elaborate on this observation.

enemy.[1] The divine power is evident instead in the charismatic action of the king. The battle account is so generalized and stereotyped that it cannot be identified with any particular battle described in the historical books. Nevertheless, the psalm is best understood as originating on the occasion of a specific victory celebration.[2] As such it shows with special clarity how the ancient ideas of holy war were adapted to the conditions of warfare under the Davidic monarchy and the Jerusalem cultic establishment.

The climactic point of the psalm is reached when Yahweh has established the king over the nations of the world (vss. 44-46). This psalm thus expresses a theology of empire in which the ultimate goal of Yahweh's charismatic endowment of the Davidic king and his holy war victory is world dominion. This theme of world dominion is essentially the same as that developed more fully in Psalms 2 and 110 where it is likewise associated with the symbolism of the ark on the one hand and holy war themes applied to the Davidic king on the other.[3]

E. The Ark as the Symbol of Royal Victory in Psalm 21

Psalm 21, like Psalm 18, describes a great holy war victory granted to the king within the context of a psalm of confidence and thanksgiving.[4]

---

[1] Cf. von Rad, Heilige Krieg, pp. 12-13.

[2] This is assumed for example by Mowinckel, Psalms, I, 71, and II, 29, 34, 100, and contrasts with the view of Johnson, Sacral Kingship, p. 112, who thinks the psalm was composed and used in connection with a ritual combat as part of the cultic drama of the annual New Year festival.

[3] See above, especially §B.

[4] Most interpreters classify this psalm as a royal thanksgiving in

The victory description (vss. 9-13) is probably a retrospective recital of an oracle originally addressed to the king as a promise of victory.[1] As with most of the royal psalms, the original purpose of this psalm is uncertain.[2] There is little basis for dating the psalm unless sporadic occurrences of the archaic suffix form *-mô* indicate a relatively early date.[3]

The word *b^{ec}ozz^{e}kā/b^{ec}uzzekā* in the opening and the closing lines of the psalm probably alludes to the ark as the symbol of Yahweh's victorious power (vss. 2 and 14).[4] In verse 14 the words *rûmâ yhwh b^{ec}uzzekā*

---

form, so Mowinckel, *Psalms*, I, 70, and Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 170-171. However, Mowinckel, I, 224, and Weiser, *Psalms*, pp. 211-212, also stress the confidence motif. This actually appears to be more basic than thanksgiving.

[1] Mowinckel, *Psalms*, I, 70, II, 62, and Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 171-173, regard these verses as an oracle. Weiser, *Psalms*, pp. 215-216, and Dahood, *Psalms 1-50*, p. 131, both believe the context and content of these verses are better understood as ascribing the victory to Yahweh. But whereas Weiser treats the imperfect forms as future in meaning, Dahood ascribes a past tense meaning to them by analogy with Ugaritic. There is no way to rule out any of these possibilities since they rest partly on varying reconstructions of the unclear text of vs. 10. Arguments from tense form in Hebrew are notoriously uncertain. However, vss. 2-8 focus upon the king as the recipient of Yahweh's blessings, making it more natural to see a continuation of this same focus in vss. 9-12.

[2] Weiser, *Psalms*, pp. 210-216, entitles it "The Coronation of the King," on the basis of vs. 4. It is connected with an annual festival for the king by Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, pp. 122-124, tentatively Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 169-170, and apparently Mowinckel, *Psalms*, I, 70. Dahood, *Psalms 1-50*, p. 131, and possibly Mowinckel, *Psalms*, II, 62, connect it with an actual battle.

[3] Statistics are *t^{e}šîtēmô*, vss. 10,13; *piryāmô*, vs. 11; contrast *y^{e}ball^{ec}ēm w^{e}tō'k^{e}lēm*, vs. 10; *zar^{c}ām*, vs. 11; and *p^{e}nêhem*, vs. 13.

[4] On this point see Davies, "The Ark in the Psalms," p. 60, and the discussion in chap. 1, §§C,E, chap. 2, §E, and chap. 4, §A.

are reminiscent of the various ark chants found in Psalm 132:8 = II Chronicles 6:41; Numbers 10:35; and Psalm 68:2.[1] The words *yhwh b^{ec}ozz^{e}kā yiśmaḥ-melek* may also reflect a dynastic oracle inscribed on one of the free-standing pillars at the entrance to the Solomonic temple.[2] These connections indicate that Psalm 21 may express important ideas and themes from the early monarchy in connection with the Davidic dynasty and the Zion temple cult.

The words of confidence in the first part of the psalm (vss. 2-8) present holy war victory as the means whereby Yahweh bestows almost godlike glory and majesty upon the king *gādôl k^{e}bôdô bîšû^{c}ātekā* / *hôd w^{e}hādār t^{e}šawweh ^{c}ālāyw* (vs. 6).[3] The expressions *kābôd* and *hôd w^{e}hādār* have theophany-like overtones, perhaps implying that the divine power symbolized by the ark manifests itself in holy war victory wrought through the king.[4] The eternal blessing granted to the king is equated by synonymous parallelism with the privilege of rejoicing in Yahweh's presence, perhaps again referring to the symbolism of the ark (vs. 7).[1] The king's relationship to Yahweh is at the same time described as "placing trust" (bôṭēaḥ) in him, a fundamental element in the ancient holy war ideology (vs. 8a).[2] The expressions ^{c}elyôn and bal-yimmôṭ echo vaguely the language of Canaanite cosmological mythology which is here completely demythologized and applied metaphorically to the covenant faithfulness (ḥesed) of Yahweh toward the Davidic king (vs. 8b).[3]

---

[1] Other passages in which the imperatives *qûmâ* or *rûmâ* are addressed to Yahweh may also reflect traditional language invoking his power as symbolized by the ark, Pss. 3:8; 7:7; 9:20; 10:12; 17:13; 35:2; 44:27; 57:6,12 = 108:6; 74:22; 82:8. Most of these occur in individual or communal laments, several in context with other elements of holy war language or imagery. Cf. chap. 1, §A, chap. 4, §§A,C, and above, §A.

[2] Scott, "The Pillars Jachin and Boaz," pp. 148-149, and "Jachin and Boaz," p. 781a. See the discussion above, chap. 2, §E.

[3] The word *bîšû^{c}ātekā* here should probably be translated "through your victorious intervention" in the light of the second half of the psalm, especially since it also occurs in vs. 1 in synonymous parallelism with *b^{ec}ozz^{e}kā*. Dahood, *Psalms 1-50*, p. 131, following *BDB*, definition 4, and Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, p. 93, both translate *y^{e}šû^{c}â* as "victory" in this psalm. Similarly *GB*, definition a) "Hilfe im Krieg," "Sieg."

[4] As indicated by the contexts the expression *hôd w^{e}hādār* alludes to theophany manifestations in Ps. 96:6 = I Chr. 16:26; Ps. 104:1; and Job 40:10. In Ps. 45:4 *hộd^{e}kā wah^{a}dārekā* praises the king as a godlike warrior. The word *hôd* alone alludes to theophany manifestations in Isaiah

The victory oracle itself (vss. 9-13) portrays the king's defeat of his enemies in such awesome terms that some commentators hesitate to see in it an address to the king but seek instead to interpret the second person forms as addressed to Yahweh. But the psalm throughout represents the king as the recipient of divine blessings and charismata bestowed

---

30:30; Hab. 3:3; Job 37:22; cf. Ps. 148:17. The first two of these occurrences introduce pictures of holy war interventions by Yahweh.

[1] The expression ʾet-pāneykā in this context must allude to the ark once again. On lipnê yhwh and related expressions as allusions to the ark see Davies, "The Ark in the Psalms," pp. 60-61, and "Ark of the Covenant," p. 225b.

[2] Cf. von Rad, Heilige Krieg, pp. 9-10, 31. The verb bṭḥ does not itself occur in any of the traditional holy war stories. However it occurs repeatedly in the speeches of the Rabshakeh trying to dissuade the defenders of Jerusalem from foolishly relying on Yahweh or the Egyptians for protection and deliverance during the Assyrian invasion under Sennacherib, II Kgs. 18:5,19-24,30; 19:10; and parallels in Is. 36.

[3] On ^{c}elyôn as a divine title deriving from Jebusite traditions but assimilated to the holy war and theophany symbolism of the ark see the discussion of Gen. 14:17-24; Ps. 82; Deut. 32, and Canaanite background material in chap. 4, §§B,C. The expression bal-timmôṭ referring to the divinely established stability of the world occurs several times in stereotyped expressions reflecting Elyon cosmological imagery, especially in close connection with the picture of Yahweh's cosmic enthronement, Pss. 93:1; 96:10; 104:5; cf. Ps. 82:5; Is. 24:19. The same expression and imagery is applied to Zion, Pss. 46:6; 125:1.

through the powerful presence of the ark. Thus the king himself is conceived as the instrument of Yahweh's victorious action almost as if Yahweh's own power as symbolized cultically by the ark had been conferred upon him.[1] The mere appearance of the king in wrath consumes the enemy like a fire (vs. 10).[2] Such fire imagery is elsewhere used of divine wrath in theophany-style language.[3] The brief picture of the king's victory here is comparable especially to the much more detailed recital in Psalm 18:33-43 discussed above and reflects essentially the same picture of the victorious action of Yahweh taking place through the king. In both cases the symbolism of the ark is clearly evident in the larger context.

F. Yahweh's Name at Zion as the Source of Royal Victory in Psalm 20

Psalm 20 holds the interrelated Zion and David themes closely together, resembling Psalms 18 and 21 in form and content and confirming some of the inferences drawn from them. The lack of archaisms and the repeated references to Yahweh's *šēm* are usually taken as pointing to the later period of the monarchy such as the time of Hezekiah or Josiah.[1] If so, the similarities between Psalms 18, 20 and 21 show the persistence of the theme of holy war associated with the Davidic king and Zion and perhaps also some modifications of emphasis. In form, Psalm 20 is a communal prayer asking Yahweh to grant victory in battle to the king. In contrast to the typical structure of the lament there is a brief anticipation of coming distress (vs. 2) but no description of present peril or disaster. This may indicate that the psalm does not visualize the danger as acute.[2] The first part of the psalm (vss. 2-6) is an invocation of Yahweh's help addressed to the king by priestly singers or some other representative group in connection with his offering of sacrifices. The second part (vss. 7-9) expresses confidence that the prayer has been granted and that Yahweh's victorious intervention is assured. As in many laments, this transition from appeal to assurance is best explained by assuming that an oracle or some similar assurance of divine aid has been spoken.[3] The content of such an oracle may be reflected in the reference to divine intervention from heaven in verse 7.

---

[1] Essentially this same situation occurs in Pss. 2 and 110 as discussed above, and perhaps explains the similar attribution of near divine power and status to the king in Ps. 45:4-7.

[2] This is the probable sense of the verse even though the textual irregularities cannot be fully resolved. The word *yhwh* taken as vocative is one possible starting point for the claim that vss. 9-13 are addressed to Yahweh rather than the king. However if one follows the MT as it stands *yhwh* is more naturally taken with *b^{e}’appô* *y^{e}ball^{ec}ēm* as a temporary shift to a third person hymnic reference to Yahweh (so RSV). Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 168, deletes *yhwh* and emends *b^{e}’appô* to *’app^{e}kā* which produces a consistent second person style; cf. LXX mss. A, B, S, *kurie* *en* *orgēi* *sou* *suntaraxeis* *autous*.

[3] Cf. Ps. 18:9; Is. 10:17; 30:27,30,33; Mal. 3:19; and perhaps Amos 1-2 *passim*; Is. 31:9; 33:14.

---

[1] Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 164, tentatively dates this psalm to the Deuteronomic period. There is no positive evidence to support a date in the time of David as suggested by Weiser, *Psalms*, p. 206.

[2] On this point see Mowinckel, *Psalms*, I, 219, and II, 62, who calls psalms of this kind "protective psalms" used in connection with days of prayer and fasting during the initial stages of a war or military expedition.

[3] So most interpreters; cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 163-164, 166, and Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 132-133. On the other hand Weiser, *Psalms*, pp. 207-208, argues that a cultic-liturgical representation or recital of the *Heilsgeschichte* has taken place but offers little supporting evidence.

The appeal in the first half of the psalm represents Yahweh's aid and support as coming from the sanctuary which is equated by synonymous parallelism with Zion, *yišlaḥ-^{c}ezr^{e}kā* *miqqōdeš* / *ûmiṣṣiyyôn* *yis^{c}ādekkā* (vs. 3). The assurance in the second half pictures his response as coming from his heavenly dwelling place, *ya^{ca}nēhû* *mišš^{e}mê* *qodšô* / *bigbûrôt* *yēšaᶜ* *y^{e}mînô* (vs. 7). Thus once again there is a seeming correlation of these two ways of representing spatially and pictorially the source of Yahweh's action which can best be explained on the assumption that Zion and the sanctuary represent a cosmic heavenly prototype. However there is only a faint hint of theophany imagery in verse 7. Otherwise there is no indication as to the manner in which Yahweh's intervention is conceived or visualized. Nevertheless the assurance that Yahweh will grant victory to his anointed king reflects the ancient holy war traditions which are here associated in the closest possible way with Zion and the Davidic king.[1] The words of assurance build up to a climax stressing the contrast between the victory of those who trust Yahweh and the defeat of the enemy who trust in chariots and horses (vs. 9).[2] As the symbols of Yahweh's gift of victory to the king, Zion itself and Yahweh's *šēm* (vss. 1-2) have seemingly replaced the ark and cherubim which formed the cultic focal point of the theophany recital in Psalm 18 and the victory oracle or recital in Psalm 21. Yet the word *šēm* itself may still refer to the traditional symbolism of the ark.[1]

---

[1] Following the hint of von Rad, *Heilige Krieg*, p. 82, both Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 166, and Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 133, note the occurrence of holy war themes here. Schreiner notes in the words *kār^{ec}û* *w^{e}nāpālû* of vs. 9 an echo of the Song of Deborah (Jud. 5:29; cf. Pederson, *Israel*, III-IV, 13.

[2] This theme also occurs in the prophets where horses and chariots are regarded as a false form of security mentioned sometimes alongside idolatry, Am. 2:15; Hos. 1:7; 14:4; Is. 2:7; 31:1,3; Mic. 5:9; Hag. 2:22; cf. Deut. 17:16.

G. Summary

This chapter has attempted to show that in the royal psalms the twin theological themes of the election of Zion and the election of the Davidic dynasty both rested upon the traditions concerning the coming of the ark to Zion. At the same time the coming of the ark was conceived as the culmination of the *Heilsgeschichte* in which Yahweh, after abandoning Shiloh, ceased his wandering by establishing his permanent resting place at Zion. The ark in Zion continued to be the symbol of Yahweh's holy war power and from this developed into the symbol of Yahweh's bestowal of authority and power upon the Davidic king. Yahweh's election of both Zion and David was formulated and announced especially in oracles delivered by temple or court prophets in symbolic connection with the ark. These conclusions harmonize readily with the conclusions drawn from the study in chapter two of the cultic establishments of David and Solomon as depicted in Samuel and Kings.

The significance of Zion in the royal psalms can best be understood by assuming that, in the ark cult as established by David, the traditions of the Shiloh ark cult were preserved and at the same time adapted to symbolize the holy war triumphs and imperial power of David ruling from Zion as Yahweh's chosen instrument. With the building of the temple and the transferral of the ark from the City of David, the symbolic significance of Zion as the center of the ark cult was already firmly enough established for its topographical reference to be extended to embrace the temple hill as its new focal point. Beginning already in the time of David and Solomon the traditional theophany and holy war symbolism of the ark and cherubim deriving from Shiloh was enriched by the assimilation of Jebusite El Elyon mythological themes and cosmological imagery. This development, studied in chapter four in connection with the psalms of Yahweh's kingship, is also evident in the royal psalms. The vertical typology whereby Zion, the temple, and the ark and cherubim were the earthly representation and manifestation of Yahweh's cosmic power and dominion as Elyon was also extended to include the Davidic king ruling from Zion. Partially demythologized and fragmentized adaptations of Jebusite Elyon mythology are probably present in pictures of the king as Yahweh's son ruling from Yahweh's sacred mountain and in pictures of the king as a godlike member of Yahweh's heavenly court designated to rule the earth on his behalf. These pictures do not constitute a full-fledged divine kingship mythology but function instead to stress not only the authority of the king but also his dependence on the holy war power of Yahweh. The pictures of victory granted to the king by Yahweh continued to keep alive in a modified way the ancient faith in Yahweh's holy war intervention symbolized by the ark.

---

[1] Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 170, thinks that *šēm* in Psalm 20 has essentially the same meaning as ^{c}*ōz* in Ps. 21, both referring to the protective power of Yahweh. On the connection of the Deuteronomic name theology with the ark see Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 161-163; cf. chap. 1, §F.

Since these various themes relating to Zion and David occur in such varying combinations and forms in different psalms, one must beware of any synthesis which posits an excessive degree of ideological or cultic uniformity. During the 400-year history of the Davidic dynasty and the Solomonic temple there must have been many varied and changing cultic uses and theological interpretations of these and other traditional themes and symbols. In some psalms Zion and the Davidic dynasty are held closely together in an interdependent relationship. In others one or the other alone is stressed. In some psalms allusions to the ark are much more clear and prominent than in others. Canaanite mythological themes are much more explicit in some cases than others. In some cases Yahweh's holy war intervention is depicted as coming from Zion or the sanctuary, and in other cases from heaven. One can never be sure how much this represents merely fortuitous variation, how much it reflects varying cultic situations, and how much it may represent historical variation and developments. Because of irremovable uncertainties concerning the dating of most of the psalms it is hazardous to attempt to arrange them in terms of a detailed reconstruction of cultic and thematic developments even though such developments must surely have taken place. Among the royal psalms as we have them, however, some do focus on the king as the symbol and instrument of Yahweh's victorious dominion in such a way as to suggest that the traditional holy war power of the ark at Zion has been channeled mainly through the king. Other psalms focus so exclusively on Zion as to suggest that the traditional symbolism of the ark has been transferred to Zion itself independently of the king. This is the case especially in the so-called songs of Zion studied in the next chapter.

CHAPTER VI. ZION AS A THEOLOGICAL SYMBOL IN THE SONGS OF ZION

The songs of Zion show the significance of Zion as a fully developed symbol in its own right and no longer as just a corollary of its role as the seat of the ark and of the Davidic dynasty. To this group of psalms belong especially Psalms 46, 48, and 76.[1] Psalm 76 will be studied first since it reflects archaic Israelite themes associated with Zion without significant evidence of influence from Jebusite Elyon mythology. Psalms 46 and 48, which do reflect such influence, must then be studied in detail in the light of comparative mythological material, both biblical and non-biblical, to determine the effect of this influence upon traditional Israelite Zion themes.

A. Zion as a Holy War Theophany Symbol in Psalm 76

The traditional view connecting Psalm 76 with Sennacherib's invasion of 701 has been abandoned by most recent interpreters.[2] With more plausibility, some have seen instead allusions to events in the time of David.[3] Others interpret it entirely in terms of a New Year myth and ritual fight against chaos.[4] Still others have interpreted it eschato-

---

[1] For Gunkel's grouping of these songs together as a hymnic subcategory under the label *Zionslieder* see Johnson, "The Psalms," p. 166.

[2] See especially O. Eissfeldt, "Psalm 76" (1957), *KS*, III, 448-450; cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 525, Weiser, *Psalms*, p. 525. The antiquity of this view is shown by the words *pros ton Assyrion* added to the superscription in the LXX. Attempts to make it a Maccabean psalm likewise have little support today.

[3] Eissfeldt, "Psalm 76," pp. 450-457, Weiser, *Psalms*, pp. 525-526.

[4] Mowinckel, *Psalms*, I, 85-87, 142, 153, Leslie, *Psalms*, pp. 39-40; cf. Eissfeldt, "Psalm 76," p. 450, and Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 525.

CHAPTER VI. ZION AS A THEOLOGICAL SYMBOL IN THE SONGS OF ZION

The songs of Zion show the significance of Zion as a fully developed symbol in its own right and no longer as just a corollary of its role as the seat of the ark and of the Davidic dynasty. To this group of psalms belong especially Psalms 46, 48, and 76.[1] Psalm 76 will be studied first since it reflects archaic Israelite themes associated with Zion without significant evidence of influence from Jebusite Elyon mythology. Psalms 46 and 48, which do reflect such influence, must then be studied in detail in the light of comparative mythological material, both biblical and non-biblical, to determine the effect of this influence upon traditional Israelite Zion themes.

A. Zion as a Holy War Theophany Symbol in Psalm 76

The traditional view connecting Psalm 76 with Sennacherib's invasion of 701 has been abandoned by most recent interpreters.[2] With more plausibility, some have seen instead allusions to events in the time of David.[3] Others interpret it entirely in terms of a New Year myth and ritual fight against chaos.[4] Still others have interpreted it eschatologically.[1] But the portrayal of Yahweh's defeat of the enemy at Zion has closest affinities with hymnic holy war traditions of the same general character as those noted repeatedly in connection with Zion.

---

[1] For Gunkel's grouping of these songs together as a hymnic subcategory under the label *Zionslieder* see Johnson, "The Psalms," p. 166.

[2] See especially O. Eissfeldt, "Psalm 76" (1957), *KS*, III, 448-450; cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 525, Weiser, *Psalms*, p. 525. The antiquity of this view is shown by the words *pros ton Assyrion* added to the superscription in the LXX. Attempts to make it a Maccabean psalm likewise have little support today.

[3] Eissfeldt, "Psalm 76," pp. 450-457, Weiser, *Psalms*, pp. 525-526.

[4] Mowinckel, *Psalms*, I, 85-87, 142, 153, Leslie, *Psalms*, pp. 39-40; cf. Eissfeldt, "Psalm 76," p. 450, and Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 525.

The psalm divides easily into four strophes, each introduced in hymnlike fashion. The hymnic participle *nôda^c* introduces the first strophe (vss. 2-4), referring to Yahweh in third person style. The second and third strophes (vss. 5-7,8-10), each introduced by the hymnic participle *nôrā’*, are addressed as words of praise to Yahweh.[2] The last strophe, introduced by the hymnic connecting word *kî*, is likewise addressed to Yahweh. Each strophe presents an allusive word picture of Yahweh's power in holy war and hymnic theophany terms.

In the opening strophe, Yahweh's renown throughout both Judah and Israel (vs. 2) is based upon his presence at Zion which must be symbolized by the ark (vs. 3), *way^{e}hî* *b^{e}šālēm* *sukkô* / *ûm^{ec}ōnātô* *b^{e}ṣiyyôn*. The name *šālēm* instead of *y^{e}rûšālēm* in synonymous parallelism with Zion (vs. 3) may be no more than a hypocoristicon playing upon the adjective *šālēm* and the noun *šālôm*.[3] The word *sukkô* is infrequent as a designation of the Jerusalem sanctuary.[1] But it may reflect archaic terminology inherited from David's tent sanctuary and its Shiloh antecedent.[2] This is supported by the synonymous parallelism of *sukkô* with *'oh^{o}lô* in Psalm 27:5, referring to the cultic asylum function of the Jerusalem ark and cherubim sanctuary.[3] The word *m^{ec}ônâ* and its synonymous variant *mā^{c}ôn* are also archaic terms, elsewhere referring to Yahweh's protective presence in the sanctuary in close connection with hymnic storm theophany language of premonarchic origin.[4]

---

[1] Gressmann, *Der Messias*, pp. 117-118, 146-147, 173. Weiser, *Psalms*, pp. 525-529, divides the psalm rather arbitrarily into historical retrospect (vss. 2-7) and eschatological prospect (vss. 8-13). For a brief review of eschatological interpretations see Eissfeldt, "Psalm 76," pp. 449-450.

[2] Emend MT *nā’ôr*, vs. 5, to *nôrā’* with Theodotion and the Targum as cited by *BH* and Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 524; cf. the recurrence of the word in vss. 8,13. The initial *’attâ* of vs. 8 is superfluous and should probably be deleted with *BH* and Kraus.

[3] See chap. 3, §A. On the only other occurrence of *šālēm* as a substitute for *y^{e}rušālēm*, Gen. 14:18, see chap. 4, §B.

Picturing Yahweh as "breaking" the weapons of the enemy, verse 4 alludes to some unidentified tradition concerning a holy war victory at Zion. Though no enemy attack on Zion is mentioned in the context, most interpreters have assumed without question that the verse presupposes such an attack which Yahweh repulses. But this is not self-evident. By comparison with Psalms 46 and 48 many assume further that this theme did not originate as an Israelite tradition at all but rather in a Canaanite-style myth of the high god repelling the attempt of a subordinate deity to usurp his sacred mountain.[1] However there is little in the context of Psalm 76 to indicate such a mythical background. If verse 3 alludes to Yahweh's election of the Zion sanctuary symbolized by the bringing of the ark in the time of David, as Kraus argues, then verse 4 might represent his conquest of Jerusalem as a holy war victory on which this was based.[2] While this can be offered only as a conjecture, the basic point stands that Zion is depicted in quite non-mythological terms as the place of Yahweh's holy war victory.

---

[1] In two of its five occurrences the word refers to the lair of a lion, Ps. 10:9 and Jer. 25:38. But no such connotation is evident in the other three occurrences of the word, Pss. 27:5; 76:3; Lam. 2:6 (spelled *śukkô*) where it refers to the Jerusalem sanctuary.

[2] Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 526, Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 233; cf. Eissfeldt, "Psalm 76," pp. 450, 456.

[3] Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 224-225. In Lam. 2:6 LXX renders *skēnōma autou* which need not reflect a Hebrew reading *miškānô* as assumed by *BH* but rather a traditional understanding of *śukkô* (= *sukkô*) as a synonym of *miškānô*; cf. Vulg. *tentorium suum* for *śukkô* and *tabernaculum suum* for the synonymous parallel *mô^{ca}dô* which is sometimes emended to *miškānô* (*BH*) or to *m^{ec}ônātô* as in Ps. 76:3; cf. H. J. Kraus, *Klagelieder* (BKAT, 20; 2. Aufl., Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag des Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1960), pp. 43-44.

[4] See Deut. 33:26-27, *m^{ec}ônâ '^{e}lôhê qedem*, and Ps. 68:5-6, *'^{e}lôhîm b^{e}mā^{c}ôn qodšô*; cf. chap. 1, §E, and chap. 4, §A. Note also Ps. 26:8 where *m^{ec}ôn bêtekā* has *m^{e}qôm miškan k^{e}bôdekā* as its synonymous parallel.

The second strophe portrays the defeat as a deadening sleep that overcomes the enemy warriors and chariotry so that they cannot fight (*nāmû* *š^{e}nātām*, vs. 6; *nirdām*, vs. 7). The word *migga^{ca}rāt^{e}kā* "at your rebuke" (vs. 7) implies a theophany-like manifestation with cosmic overtones characteristic of the premonarchic holy war storm theophany tradition colored by the exodus victory tradition.[3] The third strophe elaborates this theophany picture in terms of a divine proclamation of judgment from heaven which terrifies and paralyzes the earth (vs. 9).[1] If the common emendation of *mē’āz* in verse 8 be accepted, the resulting phrase, *mē^{c}ōz ’appekā*, may conceal another allusion to the holy war symbolism of the ark.[2]

---

[1] For example, Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 344, 526, *Worship*, pp. 202-203.

[2] See Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 526. There is no reason why vs. 4 cannot be the basis of vs. 3 rather than vice versa. Less plausible is the view of Weiser, *Psalms*, p. 526, and Eissfeldt, "Psalm 76," pp. 451-452, 456, that vs. 4 refers to David's victory over the Philistines. The word *šāmmâ* locates the action emphatically at Zion; cf. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 233. On the correlation of David's conquest of Zion with the bringing of the ark see chap. 2, §C, and chap. 5, §A.

[3] On the noun *g^{ec}ārâ* see Pss. 18:16; 104:7; cf. 80:17. The verb *gā^{c}ar* is used similarly in Pss. 68:31; cf. 9:6; 106:9. On the phrase *wārekeb* *wāsûs* see Ex. 15:1. Cf. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 234.

The last strophe represents the kings of the earth (vs. 13) as submissively bringing their tribute to Yahweh at Zion (vss. 11-12). The stereotyped phrase, *yôbîlû šay* (vs. 12), also occurs in Psalm 68:30 (cf. Is. 18:7) depicting a similar pilgrimage of kings to Jerusalem to pay tribute in response to Yahweh's holy war theophany manifestations centered at Jerusalem.[3] Both passages may celebrate hymnically the actual imperial sway of Zion during the united monarchy. In Psalm 76 this possibility is strengthened if commonly suggested emendations of verse 11 be accepted, *ḥ^{a}mat ’^{e}dôm* and *š^{e}’ērît ḥ^{a}māt* plus *t^{e}ḥoggekā* for MT *taḥgōr*.[4] The tribute pilgrimage of the kings is exemplified by the two nations at the extreme north and south ends of David's empire.[5] Thus Psalm 76, like

---

[1] Jeremias, *Theophanie*, p. 18, regards this as a variation of the traditional theophany *Gattung*.

[2] In support of this emendation see *BH*, Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 524, Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 234, and the analogy of *^{c}ōz ’appekā*, Ps. 90:11. Note also the verb *qûm*, with Yahweh as subject (vs. 10), perhaps reflecting the ark chant.

[3] See chap. 4, §A.

[4] LXX *heortasei soi* supports *t^{e}ḥoggekā*. On the vocalizations *’^{e}dôm* for *’ādām* and *ḥ^{a}māt* for *ḥēmōt* see Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 524-525, and the discussion by Eissfeldt, "Psalm 76," pp. 451-456. Eissfeldt's emendation *ḥ^{a}māt ’^{a}rām* is also plausible.

[5] For summarizing accounts of the submission of Hamath to David and David's conquests of Edom and Zobah see II Sam. 8:3-14. According to vss. 11-12 David consecrated to Yahweh the tribute money brought from Hamath and all the conquered nations.

Psalms 2, 68 and 110, is best understood in the light of the triumphant Yahwism of the ark cult at Zion during the time of the united monarchy, whether or not the psalm itself is of such an early date.[1] In agreement with Psalm 68, Zion is the center of Yahweh's holy war power and his victorious theophany intervention subduing the nations. In contrast to Psalms 2 and 110, the submission of the nations is a direct response to Yahweh's theophany manifestation at Zion and is not mediated through the Davidic king. Thus Zion, the place of the ark, is an imperial victory symbol in its own right.

B. The Mythical Titles of Honor for Zion in Psalm 48:2-4

The term Zion occurs three times in Psalm 48. These three occurrences show the basic theological symbolism of Zion and at the same time a continuing diversity in the usage of the term. Most recent commentators accept a pre-exilic dating for this psalm but reject the attempts of earlier commentators to connect it with Sennacherib's withdrawal from Jerusalem in 701.[2] Recent discussions emphasize instead the importance of pre-Israelite mythological traditions as the underlying factor in the picture of the great attack on Zion.

Psalm 48 may be analyzed into two main divisions, verses 2-9 and 10-15. The first half of the psalm consists of a third-person style laudatory hymnic statement or proclamation praising Yahweh as he has revealed himself in defense of his city (vss. 2-8), followed by a confessional response in first-person-plural form on the part of the worshipping congregation (vs. 9). Verses 2-8 may be divided into two four-line subsections (vss. 2-4 and 5-8). The first of these is introduced by a stereotyped hymnic formula, *gādôl yhwh ûm^{e}hullāl m^{e}'ōd* (cf. Pss. 96:4; 145:3), which is then expanded by the phrase *b^{ec}îr '^{e}lôhênû* introducing the specific theme of the psalm. It should be noted that *^{c}îr '^{e}lôhênû* (City of Our God), repeated in verse 9, is the primary term in this part of the psalm rather than Zion. Placed in apposition to this term (vss. 2c-3) is a list of six laudatory titles for City of Our God in a style reminiscent of the hymnic list of royal titles in Isaiah 9:6.

---

[1] See chap. 5, §§B,C.

[2] Cf. Kraus, Psalmen, I, 357-359, Schreiner, Sion-Jerusalem, pp. 230-231, and Weiser, Psalms, p. 381.

2c-3a *har-qodšô* / *y^{e}pēh nôp* / *m^{e}śôś kol-hā'āreṣ*
3bc *har-ṣiyyôn* / *yark^{e}tê ṣāpôn* / *qiryat melek rāb*

The term *har-ṣiyyôn* occurs simply as one of these six laudatory titles. This four-line subsection closes with a line (vs. 4) that is poetically parallel to the opening line.

2ab *gādôl yhwh ûm^{e}hullāl m^{e}'ōd* / *b^{ec}îr '^{e}lôhênû*

. . . .

4 *'^{e}lôhîm b^{e}'arm^{e}nôteyhā* / *nôda^{c} l^{e}miśgāb*

At the same time verse 4 forms a transition to the second subsection.

Of greatest interest in the list of laudatory titles in verses 2c-3 is the term *yark^{e}tē ṣāpôn*, which must be translated "heights of Zaphon" or the like.[1] By widespread scholarly consensus this term must be understood primarily in the light of the fragmentary myth narrated in Isaiah

---

[1] See II Kgs. 19:23 = Is. 37:24 where *yark^{e}tê l^{e}bānôn* is the synonymous parallel of *m^{e}rôm hārîm*; cf. Schmid, "*Kulttraditionen*," p. 188, Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes*, p. 25, and Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 228.

14:12-15. When taken in conjunction with the role of Mt. Zaphon near Ugarit as the dwelling place of Baal in Ugaritic mythology, this passage shows clearly the Canaanite religious background of the term.[1] As used in the context of a taunt song against the king of Babylon in Isaiah 14:4-21, the myth serves to dramatize the fall of Babylon from the heights of world power to the depths of destruction and dishonor. Although removed from its original cultic and mythological setting and demythologized in its application, the passage still reveals the basic features of a myth based on the rising of the morning star, *hêlēl* *ben-šāḥar* (vs. 12), and its sudden disappearance with the rising of the sun.[2] The theme of the myth is the attempt of a subordinate deity to usurp the place of the supreme god, Elyon, on the cosmic world mountain.

13 *w^{e}’attâ* *’āmartā* *bilbāb^{e}kā* / *haššāmayim* *’e^{ce}leh*
mimma^{c}al *l^{e}kôk^{e}bê-’ēl* / *’ārîm* *kis’î*
w^{e}’ēšēb *b^{e}har-mô^{c}ēd* / *b^{e}yark^{e}tê* *ṣāpôn*
14 *’e^{ce}leh* *^{c}al-bom^{o}tê* *^{c}āb* / *’eddammeh* *l^{ec}elyôn*

But instead he is cast down to *š^{e}’ôl* which has *yark^{e}tê-bôr* as its poetic parallel. The equating of the skies above the stars and clouds with the heights of Zaphon as the assembly mountain of the gods, and the contrast with the underworld, shows the cosmic symbolism of the myth and at the same time its probable original connection with the sacred mountain of

---

[1] See the summary discussions in W. F. Albright, "Baal Zaphon," *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet*, pp. 1-14, Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes*, pp. 25-27, Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 3-11, 46-48, and Kraus, *Worship*, pp. 201-203.

[2] Childs, *Myth and Reality*, pp. 67-70, and Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, p. 85. See also Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 259, 261-262.

Baal near Ugarit.

In one Ugaritic text Zaphon, Baal's mountain, is described by a series of honorific titles somewhat reminiscent of Psalm 48:2c-3, *btk ǵry il ṣpn* / *bqdš bǵr nḥlty* / *bn^{c}m bgb^{c} tliyt*.[1] Sometimes this mountain is referred to simply as *ṣpn*,[2] but in the so-called Baal and Anat cycle more often as *mrym ṣpn*[3] (height or summit of Zaphon), or *ṣrrt ṣpn*[4] (heights or fastness of Zaphon). In the *Krt* saga it is called *ǵr b^{c}l* and *ḥlm qdš*.[5] However, no close Ugaritic parallels have so far been found to the myth of Helel ben Shahar and Elyon in Isaiah 14.[6] In the Ugaritic texts it is always Baal and never El or any other deity who is associated with Zaphon.[7] Neither is Zaphon the place of the divine assembly (*pḫr m^{c}d*).[8]

---

[1] *UM*, *^{c}nt*:III:26-28, translated by Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes*, p. 25, "Inmitten meines Berges, des Gottes Zaphon, an heiligen Ort, auf dem Berg meines Eigentums, an lieblichen Ort, auf dem Hügel des Sieges." Cf. *ANET*, p. 136.

[2] *UM*, 51:VII:6; 76:III:31; *^{c}nt*:x:IV:5,18; etc.

[3] *UM*, 51:IV:19; V:85; *^{c}nt*:IV:82; etc.

[4] *UM*, 51:V:117; *^{c}nt*:I:21-22; etc. [5] *UM*, 125:6-7,107-108.

[6] In *UM*, 52:52-53, *šhr* appears as the morning star and *šlm* as the evening star whose birth as twin gods to *il* is narrated. Cf. J. Gray, articles "Shahar" and "Shalem (God)," *IDB*, IV, 303-304.

[7] Other names and titles applied to Baal include *alyn b^{c}l*, *hd*, *bn dgn*, *b^{c}l ṣpn*, *zbl b^{c}l* and *rkb ^{c}rpt*. Cf. Kapelrud, *Ras Shamra Discoveries*, pp. 35-37. The divine name *b^{c}l ṣpn* also occurs in a sixth century Phoenician papyrus from Egypt, *KAI*, 50:2-3, and in a third century Phoenician temple text from France, *KAI*, 69:1.

[8] So Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 5, 7, and Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes*, p. 24, against Gasper, *Thespis*, pp. 138, 447, who argues that *ṣpn* was also the dwelling place of *il* and the Mountain of Assembly. Clements argues that these were three distinct mountains. In two obscure contexts on a fragmentary tablet, *UM*, *^{c}nt*:ix:II:23, III:22, the mountain of *il* is

Furthermore, the mythology of Baal and Anat associated with Zaphon in the Ugaritic texts is not concerned with astral phenomena but with the cycle of dry season and rainy season and with fertility rituals which accompanied them.[1] But there is an underlying similarity between the Baal mythology of Ugarit and the Elyon myth of Isaiah 14. Both are conflict myths in which the position of one god is challenged by another god. However, the conflicts of Baal in the Ugaritic texts are with *mt* (Mot, Death), the god of the underworld, and with *ym* (Sea), also called *zbl ym* (Prince Sea), perhaps identical with *ltn* and *tnn* (compare Old Testament *liwyātān* and *tannîn*).[2] The story of Anat rescuing Baal from Mot and the subsequent victory of Baal over Mot is connected with the return of Baal from the underworld to his throne on Zaphon.[3] There is nothing in the

---

called *ḫršn*. (Cf. Clements, p. 10.) In *UM*, 137:20 the *pḫr* *m^{c}d* (divine assembly) including both *il* and *b^{c}l* is said to be on a mountain which is called *ǵr* *ll*.

[1] Cf. Kapelrud, *Ras Shamra Discoveries*, p. 49. For useful summaries of the mythology of Baal in the Ugaritic texts see Kapelrud, pp. 38-49, and Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes*, pp. 9-16. Most of the important texts are translated by H. L. Ginsberg, *ANET*, pp. 129-155. The fragmentary state of many of the tablets and uncertainties concerning their proper sequence make it difficult to reconstruct the myth as a whole with confidence.

[2] Kapelrud, *Ras Shamra Discoveries*, p. 39, following Gaster, *Thespis*, p. 186.

[3] *UM*, texts 137 + 68 (*ANET*, pp. 130-131) tell of an attempt by Yam to gain power over Baal and Baal's victory over him. *UM*, text 67 (*ANET*, pp. 138-139) tells of the captivity of Baal in the underworld by Mot. Apparently continuing the same story, *UM*, texts 62 + 49 (*ANET*, pp. 139-141) tells of Anat overcoming Mot, the revival of Baal, and his victory over Mot and renewed enthronement. Fragmentary references to a struggle against *ltn*, also called *bṯn* *brḥ*, *btn* *^{c}qltn*, and *šlyt* *d* *šb^{c}t* *rašm*, are found in *UM*, 67:I:1-3, repeated probably in lines 28-30 (*ANET*, p. 138). *UM*, *^{c}nt*:III:36-39 (*ANET*, p. 137) alludes to a victory of Anat over Yam, here seemingly called *tnn*, *bṯn* *^{c}qltn*, and *šlyt* *d* *šb^{c}t* *rašm*.

myth of Isaiah 14 to correspond with this. The conflicts of Baal with Yam have many echoes in other Old Testament passages, but likewise do not resemble Isaiah 14 in any close way.

Actually the comparison of Isaiah 14:12-15 with the Ugaritic material shows instead that a variety of conflict myths could be associated with Zaphon in Canaanite mythology. Furthermore it shows that in Israel there was a tendency to use conflict themes from Canaanite mythology in a quite different way. Thus the futile attempt of Helel ben Shahar to usurp the throne of Elyon on Mt. Zaphon, the cosmic world mountain, becomes a vivid though demythologized symbol for the arrogant and self-deifying pride and power of the king of Babylon who is brought low by Yahweh.[1] The whole discussion cautions against reading into Psalm 48 all of the associations which Zaphon may have in other Old Testament passages, let alone in the Ugaritic texts. The evidence shows that the term was used with widely varying associations in different literary and cultic contexts. Therefore we are finally thrown back upon the associations which we actually find in Psalm 48.

The term *har-qodšô* in Psalm 48:2c is another one of the six laudatory titles placed in apposition to City of Our God. This term and its variants such as *har-qodšî*, *har-qodš*^{e}*kā*, *har qōdeš ’*^{e}*lôhîm* and *har qōdeš* are of such frequent and varied occurrence in the Old Testament (approximately twenty times) that they cannot all be studied and compared here. The occurrence of the term *har qōdeš ’*^{e}*lôhîm* (Holy Mountain of God) in Ezekiel 28:14 is of special interest, however, since this is a mythological passage comparable to the Isaiah 14 passage discussed above. Ezekiel 28:11-19 is introduced as a lament over the king of Tyre and is the last of a long collection of oracles of various kinds directed against Tyre (Ezek. 26:1-28:19). The myth narrated here does not have as direct a conflict motif as Isaiah 14 and the application of the myth to the king of Tyre is integrated more closely into the narration of the myth itself. The king of Tyre is not portrayed as a rival god of Yahweh but rather as a created being placed in *^{c}ēden gan-’^{e}lōhîm* (vs. 13).[1] In verse 14, however, his appointed place is called *har qōdeš ’^{e}lōhîm* and in verse 16 simply *har-’^{e}lōhîm*. His marvelous wisdom, beauty and blamelessness are emphasized (vss. 12,15). He is provided with a covering or shelter of precious stones and a guardian cherub (vss. 13-14).[2]

---

[1] Childs, *Myth and Reality*, pp. 8, 67-70.

---

[1] H. G. May, "The King in the Garden of Eden: A Study of Ezekiel 28: 12-19," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, pp. 166-176, brings together much evidence to show that the figure here is that of a mythical royal First Man in Eden who would also be the prototype of the first man (*hā’ādām*) in Gen. 2-3, of prototypal man (*’^{e}nôš*, *ben-’ādām*) in Ps. 8:4-9, of primordial Wisdom in Prov. 8:22-36, and of the Son of Man figure (*k^{e}bar ’^{e}nāš*) in Dan. 7:13-14; cf. Job 15:7-8; 25:1-6; 38:4-7. In this and other details the myth has a clear similarity to Gen. 2-3, which however is notably less mythological in its coloring. Cf. von Rad, *Genesis*, pp. 76, 95.

[2] The word *m^{e}sûkātekā* (or *m^{e}sukkātekā*) in vs. 13 could conceivably refer to a sheltering roof or pavilion of some kind rather than a bejeweled garment or binding as implied probably by the LXX (*endedesai*) and the Vulg. (*opus decoris tui*). In the textually obscure first line of vs. 14 read *’et* for MT *’at*, with LXX and Syriac; cf. *BH*, RSV. The meaning of *m^{e}sûkâ* is probably connected with the meaning of the verb *skk* in the equally obscure phrase *k^{e}rûb mimšaḥ hassôkēk* in vs. 14. The verb *skk* is also associated with the cherubim above the ark in I Kgs. 8:7 (*wayyāsōkkû*, for which the parallel in II Chr. 5:8 substitutes *way^{e}kassû*, from the more common verb *ksh*), I Chr. 28:18; Ex. 25:20; 37:39 (all *sôk^{e}kîm*). The word *mimšaḥ* applied to the *k^{e}rûb* in vs. 14 is entirely obscure. The translation "anointed" is a guess based on etymology, though it already occurs in the Hexaplaric corrections from Theodotion preserved in Codex Q.

He is said to walk about *bᵉtôk ’abnê-’ēš* (vs. 14), which may refer to the stars or to lightning, in either case revealing the cosmic symbolism of the underlying myth.[1] However, because of his sin he is driven out of his appointed dwelling place among the stars (vs. 16), cast down upon the earth (vs. 17), and burned with fire (vs. 18). It is not said directly that he attempted to deify himself or usurp the place of God. In fact, the three sins charged against him have no obvious connection with one another. Fitting most closely with the preceding context is pride which led him to pervert his wisdom for the sake of his own splendor (vs. 17). But in a quite nonmythological way he is also charged with unjust trading practices and with desecrating sanctuaries (vss. 16,18). Yet there is an underlying sense of conflict and self-assertion against deity. The myth resembles Isaiah 14 in its cosmic symbolism, in the theme of the supreme deity casting a potential rival down from the cosmic mountain, and in the vivid though demythologized symbolism of wartime disaster as divine judgment visited upon a completely historical nation and king.

There are no close Ugaritic or other Canaanite parallels to Ezekiel 28:12-18. Genesis 2-3 is the closest biblical parallel.[2] Yet one must suppose that both passages had non-Israelite antecedents which a lack of sources prevents us from tracing.[1] They show the varied ways in which Israel made symbolic use of inherited mythology concerning the first created being or primeval man in the paradise garden located on the cosmic world mountain or holy mountain of god. In Ezekiel 28 and Genesis 2-3 the cosmic symbolism has receded so far into the background that it can hardly be reconstructed. Instead the focus of interest is upon the myth as a symbol of human rebelliousness and self-deification which prompts divine judgment. Thus, as a demythologized symbol, it is used in precisely the same way as the myth in Isaiah 14 of a subordinate being arrogantly attempting to usurp the place of the supreme deity. In each case the explicit or implied motif of conflict with God is the element of symbolism constituting Israel's primary theological concern in using these traditional mythological themes. One certainly cannot use the occurrence of the term *har qōdeš ’^{e}lôhîm* in Ezekiel 28 and of *har qodšô* in Psalm 48 as a basis for reading all this mythological background and symbolism into Psalm 48 unless the context in Psalm 48 itself warrants it.

---

[1] See J. L. McKenzie, "Mythological Allusions in Ezek. 28:12-18," *JBL*, LXXV (1956), 324-325, Clements, *God and Temple*, p. 8, and May, "The King in the Garden of Eden," pp. 169-170. It is not clear whether *’abnê-’ēš* can be interpreted in the light of the Ugaritic phrase *abn brq*, *UM*, *ᶜnt*:III:23 (*ANET*, p. 136), supposedly referring to lightning as the flashing of the precious stones of Baal's heavenly palace; cf. *kbkbm* in the preceding line.

[2] McKenzie, "Mythological Allusions in Ezek. 28:12-18," pp. 322-327.

Returning again to the six laudatory titles placed in apposition to City of Our God in Psalm 48:2c, we may next mention briefly the two terms *y^{e}pēh nôp* and *m^{e}śôś kol-hā’āreṣ*. Kraus detects allusions to paradise in these terms. But the few partial parallels which can be cited neither support nor contradict this very strongly.[2] At most they indicate that these may have been somewhat traditional laudatory terms for Zion in cultic language. They may have carried numinous overtones suggestive of paradise but hardly appear to have very specific mythological associations.

---

[1] For distant Babylonian parallels to Gen. 2-3 see Skinner, *Genesis*, pp. 90-93; cf. Gunkel, *Genesis*, pp. 33-40.

[2] The closest parallel is Lam. 2:15 which gives *k^{e}lîlat yōpî* and *māśôś l^{e}kol-hā’āreṣ* as traditional honorific titles for Jerusalem. In Ps. 50:2, *miklal-yōpî* is a title for Zion as the place of Yahweh's theophany manifestation. For other more distant parallels see Is. 60:14; 65:18; Jer. 49:25 and Ezek. 28:12,17.

The last of the six laudatory terms placed in apposition to City of Our God in Psalm 48:2c-3 is *qiryat melek rāb*. There are no close parallels to this phrase in the Old Testament. This phrase does, however, call to mind the name *mlqrt* of the chief deity of the Phoenician city state of Tyre whose cult is attested both in Tyre and elsewhere during and after Old Testament times.[1] The cult of this same deity was likely the one introduced at Samaria by Ahab and Jezebel, becoming the focal point of the struggle with Elijah.[2] It was likewise introduced to Jerusalem, sponsored especially by Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, but appears to have been limited in scope and influence as well as short-lived (II Kgs. 11:18). Thus, if influences of the cult of Melqart stemming from Tyre ever had a significant role in Jerusalem, one must look instead to the period of David and Solomon when close political and economic relations existed with Tyre. The introduction of foreign cults to Jerusalem under Solomon is briefly indicated in I Kings 11:1-8 in connection with his marriage alliances. The presence of a Phoenician woman in Solomon's harem, indicated only by the word *ṣēd^{e}nîyyôt* (vs. 1), may reflect an important marriage alliance with Hiram of Tyre when viewed in the light of their close cooperation with one another indicated in other contexts (I Kgs. 5:15-26; 9:26-28; 10:11,22).[1] The only Phoenician cult Solomon is said to have supported was that of *^{c}aštōret* *’^{e}lōhê* *ṣîdōnîm* (I Kgs. 11:5).[2] The main emphasis in the passage is on the introduction of cult places for the Moabite god *k^{e}môš* and the Ammonite god *mōlek* or *milkōm* (vs. 7; cf. vs. 5). None of these three cults appears to have been connected with the temple of Yahweh, though they apparently remained in existence throughout most of the period of the monarchy. There is thus no doubt about the existence of a *mlk*/*mlkm* cult and of an *’štrt* cult in Jerusalem, but no evidence that either was connected with the Tyrian cult of Melqart.[3] Any connection between any of these cults or divine titles and the phrase *qiryat melek rāb* in Psalm 48:3 is even more speculative. The phrase may thus have carried mythological overtones comparable with those noted in connection with the other laudatory terms in Psalm 48:2c-3. But the fact that neither this phrase nor any very similar phrase occurs elsewhere argues against its importance as a title or cultic term for Zion or Jerusalem.

---

[1] The name *mlqrt* is a shortened form of the phrase *mlk qrt* (king of the city). It occurs in a few inscriptions contemporary with the Old Testament, mostly in theophorous names. See the sources cited by Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, p. 37. The most notable occurrence is in the Aramaic votive inscription dedicated to *mlqrt* by a Barhadad of Damascus, probably during the ninth century, which shows that this cult had already spread beyond Tyre. See text and commentary, *KAI*, 201:3-4; cf. *ANET*, p. 501. In a Phoenician votive inscription from Malta dated in the second century B.C., *mlqrt* is called *b^{c}l ṣr* and *'dnn* (our lord), *KAI*, 47:1. Most information about this deity comes from later Greek sources. On the uncertain connotations of the word see Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes*, pp. 55-56.

[2] I Kgs. 16:31-33. See J. Gray, *Kings*, pp. 350-355, who argues without direct evidence that *mlqrt* is to be identified both with *b^{c}l ṣpn* of the Ugaritic texts and with the *b^{c}l šmm* of various Phoenician texts. See also Bright, *History*, pp. 224-227, and A. Alt, "Der Stadtstaat Samaria," *KS*, III, 274-275.

---

[1] R. W. Corney, "Hiram," *IDB*, II, 606-607.

[2] Gray, *Kings*, pp. 252-253, following Montgomery, *Kings*, pp. 231-232, regards this as part of a Deuteronomic addition to the basic text.

[3] The *k^{e}môš* cult was located on the southern extension of the Mount of Olives (II Kgs. 23:13; cf. I Kgs. 11:7). A cult place for child sacrifice to *mlk*/*mlkm* was located at a place called *tōpet* (or *tepet*; cf. LXX, *tapheth*) in the Hinnom Valley (II Kgs. 23:10; Jer. 7:31-32; 32:35; cf. II Chr. 28:3; Lev. 18:21; 20:2-5; II Kgs. 16:3; 17:17; Zeph. 1:5). On these cults see Gray, *Kings*, pp. 255-259, 669-671, and "Molech, Moloch," pp. 422-423. Gray identifies both these deities with the Ugaritic Venus god *^{c}ṯtr* (*^{c}štr* *kmš* in the Moabite inscription, *KAI*, 181:17), regarding Ugaritic *^{c}ṯtrt* = Phoenician *^{c}štrt*, his female counterpart, as the chief Canaanite fertility goddess. But his further attempt to

This whole discussion of the first subsection of Psalm 48 (vss. 2-4) may now be summarized by pointing out again that the primary term for Zion is City of Our God, as confirmed by its recurrence in verse 9. Most of the other six titles are laudatory terms having only vague cosmic and mythological associations and overtones, perhaps enabling them to evoke a numinous sense of awe.[1] The phrase *b^{e}’arm^{e}nôteyhā* (vs. 4), paralleling *b^{ec}îr ’^{e}lôhênû* (vs. 2), indicates that the center of attention is fixed, not upon a cosmic mythological symbol, but upon the actual fortifications of Zion as apparent from the recurrence of that term in verse 14.

C. The Holy War Symbolism of Zion in Psalm 48:5-15

The second subsection of Psalm 48, verses 5-8, provides a more helpful clue to the symbolic significance of Zion in this psalm than do the laudatory titles just discussed. Using the transitional formula *kî-hinnēh*, these verses ground the praise of Yahweh introduced in verse 2 in an abbreviated hymnic recital of a legend-like story of his defense of

---

connect these with a pre-Israelite Jerusalem *šaḥar* and *šālēm* astral cult has little supporting evidence apart from the etymology of *y^{e}rûšālēm* (cf. chap. 3, §A) and the fragmentary myth of *hêlēl ben-šaḥar*, Is. 14:12-15.

[1] Kraus, *Worship*, p. 203, note 48, says: "The mythological elements in the Canaanite-Jebusite world were taken over by the Jerusalem cult as 'glorification sayings' ...".

the city against an attacking coalition of kings. Attempts to relate this legend to some particular siege of Jerusalem, such as that of Sennacherib in 701, are generally rejected by recent commentators for lack of any specific correspondence between the psalm and that event.[1] Kraus regards it as a "historicizing variant" of the fight against chaos in the creation myth.[2] Mowinckel classes this passage with others which he labels "the myth about the fight of the nations" and argues that behind it is the mythical struggle between Baal and Mot.[3] Kraus thinks the reference to ships of Tarshish (vs. 8) together with the earlier reference to Mt. Zaphon (vs. 3) points to a Phoenician origin of the myth. But actually the cosmic and mythological elements in the legend as recited are so minimal as to provide little basis for such views. The problem is to decide whether this is, nevertheless, the most plausible way to interpret verses 5-8.

The heart of the legend-like story of Psalm 48:5-8, verses 6-7, has notable similarities to the language of Exodus 15:14-15a.[4] These similarities reflect common traditional language depicting the panic-stricken reaction of foreign nations and kings to Yahweh's victorious self-manifestations. Exodus 15:14-16 is a hymnic picture of Yahweh overwhelming Israel's enemies as he guided his people by means of the ark to the promised land centering at the Jerusalem sanctuary, the place of Yahweh's kingship symbolized by the ark.[1] This picture of Yahweh's terror overwhelming the enemy is a traditional theme characteristic of the premonarchic holy war and hymnic theophany tradition.[2] Such traditions were associated with the ark in the cult tradition of Zion. Thus the primary background of the *Völkersturm* legend in Psalm 48:5-8 must be sought in the traditional hymnic celebration of Yahweh's holy war power rather than in Canaanite conflict myths. Language similar to Exodus 15:14-15a and Psalm 48:6-7 occurs in Isaiah 13:8, in the context of a doom oracle against Babylon, showing the persistence of such pictures originating in Israel's holy war traditions.[3]

---

[1] Oesterley, *Psalms*, p. 263, still clings to this possibility but sees also the influence of "traditional eschatology."

[2] Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 358-359.

[3] Mowinckel, *Psalms*, I, 151-154, 181-182.

[4] To Ps. 48:7, *r^{ec}ādâ ’^{a}hāzātam šām* / *hîl kayyôlēdâ*, compare Ex. 15:14-15a, *hîl ’āḥaz* and *yō’ḥ^{a}zēmô rā^{c}ad*. Note *nibh^{a}lû* in both Ps. 48:6 and Ex. 15:14. Stylistically similar are Ps. 48:6, *hēmmâ rā’û* (antecedent *hamm^{e}lākîm*), and Ex. 15:14, *šām^{ec}û ^{c}ammîm*.

Psalm 48:4-8 differs from Exodus 15:14-16 in that the defeated enemy is pictured in vaguely universal terms as "the kings" (vs. 5) rather than as specific nations. Since the focus of the attack is on Zion it can hardly represent the whole *Heilsgeschichte* in a nutshell as Weiser contends.[4] Indeed, it need not depend upon any specific battle tradition at all. Instead its vague universality corresponds to the generalizing way in which the psalm throughout depicts Yahweh's eternally dependable protection of his city, while yet using in a poetic way the concrete pictorial imagery of holy war. The reference to the east wind destroying the ships remains enigmatic (vs. 8). There is little evidence to support Kraus's contention that it represents a Canaanite mythological touch.[1] Even if so, it is here emptied of cosmological implications and used in a way that resembles the frequent holy war pictures of Yahweh wielding the forces of nature as his weapons.[2]

---

[1] See chap. 4, §D.

[2] See Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 140-142.

[3] In Is. 13:8 note especially the words *w^{e}nibhālû* / *ṣîrîm* *waḥ^{a}bālîm yōḥēzûn* / *kayyôlēdâ* *y^{e}ḥîlûn*

[4] Weiser, *Psalms*, p. 382; cf. pp. 42-45.

The intention of this whole hymnic part of the psalm (vss. 2-8) becomes evident in the congregational confession of faith in verse 9, which makes explicit the generalization toward which the laudatory titles (vss. 2-4) and the hymnic recital of Yahweh's defense of his city (vss. 5-8) have been pointing. This purpose is the vivid cultic portrayal of Yahweh as the eternally dependable basis of security for his city, *^{c}îr ʼ^{e}lôhênû*.[3]

The second half of the psalm (vss. 10-15) enlarges upon this fundamental confession and reveals a little of the cultic setting. Four lines of hymnic praise addressed to Yahweh in second person style continue the congregational response (vss. 10-12). The trustworthy dependability of Yahweh (*ḥasdekā*, vs. 10), depicted in the liturgical portrayal of his defense of his city, calls forth praise resounding universally and prompts the worshipping congregation to rejoice at his victorious deeds

---

[1] The reading *k^{e}rûaḥ* found in a few manuscripts instead of *b^{e}rûaḥ* (*BH*) would make this only a comparison rather than a part of the actual description of Yahweh's intervention.

[2] On the absence of mythological-cosmological elements in early holy war stories and hymns see von Rad, *Heilige Krieg*, pp. 32-33.

[3] In vs. 9 the term *b^{ec}îr-yhwh* *ṣ^{e}bāʼôt* preceding *b^{ec}îr* *ʼ^{e}lôhênû* is perhaps a later variant or gloss though it would in fact strengthen the case for the connection of the psalm with holy war themes. On the text see Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 355-356. Weiser, *Psalms*, pp. 379-380, following *BH*, adopts a more complicated emendation shifting *yhwh* *ṣ^{e}bāʼôt* to the next line.

(*ṣedeq*, vs. 11, *mišpāteykā*, vs. 12). In the two parallel poetic lines of verses 11c-12 the expression *har-ṣiyyôn* occurs with quite a different connotation than in verse 3. In verse 3 it is one of the six laudatory hymnic titles for *^{c}îr* *ʼ^{e}lôhênû* placed parallel to other titles having vaguely mythological and numinous overtones. But here it refers collectively to the inhabitants of Jerusalem as part of the worshipping congregation, as shown by the synonymous parallel, *b^{e}nôt* *y^{e}hûdâ*, referring collectively to the inhabitants of Judah.[1]

11c,12a *ṣedeq* *māl^{e}ʼâ* *y^{e}mîneka̅* / *yiśmaḥ* *har-siyyôn*
12bc *tāgēlnâ* *b^{e}nôt* *y^{e}hûdâ* / *l^{e}ma^{c}an* *mišpāteykā*

The last four lines of the psalm are a liturgical summons to a ritual procession around the walls of the city. Here we find a third distinct usage of the term Zion.

13 *sōbbû* *ṣiyyôn* *w^{e}haqqîpûhā* / *siprû* *migdāleyhā*
14ab *šîtû* *libb^{e}kem* *l^{e}ḥêlāh* / *pass^{e}gû* *ʼarm^{e}nôteyhā*

The terms *migdāleyhā*, *ḥêlāh* and *ʼarm^{e}nôteyhā* in the parallel positions show clearly that Zion here stresses the physical character of the city as a fortified stronghold protecting its inhabitants from military assault. Yet the entire context of the psalm indicates that Zion as a fortified stronghold is not the real basis of security. Rather it is the concrete visible symbol which each generation can point out to the next generation as a sign of the eternal enduring security to be found only in Yahweh.[1]

---

[1] This is the general meaning of *b^{e}nôt* *y^{e}hûdâ*, whether it refers literally to the "women of Judah" (*BDB*) or, as seems more likely, to the "villages of Judah" (*GB*).

D. Zion as a Symbol of Security in Yahweh in Psalm 46

Of equal importance in the group of psalms called songs of Zion is Psalm 46, even though the word Zion itself does not occur in it at all. Kraus regards this psalm as "probably very old" and dependent on pre-Israelite Jerusalem cult traditions.[2] Weiser assumes the antiquity of the psalm without discussion.[3] Thematic content rather than formal characteristics classify this psalm as a song of Zion. Its framework, especially the opening line (vs. 2) and the refrain (vss. 8,12 and, by conjecture, following vs. 4), marks it primarily as a community psalm of confidence and trust.[4] The words *’^{e}lôhîm lānû maḥ^{a}seh wa^{c}ōz* (vs. 2) may suggest the asylum function of the ark sanctuary.[5]

The basis for the confession of confidence and trust in Yahweh is given (*^{c}al-kēn lô’-nîrā’*, vs. 3) in a series of hymnlike statements portraying the victorious power of Yahweh over the most frightening threats and disasters imaginable. These hymnlike statements use imagery which vaguely echoes Canaanite mythological themes. The picture of the mountains shaking and the sea in an uproar calls to mind primarily an earthquake (vss. 3-4). But the picture implies also a threatened cosmic upheaval in which the foundations of the earth collapse and the chaos waters overwhelm the world. This imagery then merges into a picture of the nations in an uproar and shaking (vs. 7).[1] It is not clear whether these chaotic manifestations represent forces in rebellion against Yahweh or catastrophes released by Yahweh.[2] If this traditional phraseology alludes to the Noah flood legend as in Isaiah 54:10, the passage would imply primarily a catastrophic divine judgment. On the other hand, it may echo a familiar Canaanite mythological theme of the chaotic powers of the sea in rebellion against the supreme deity.[3] The vagueness of the allusions probably indicates they were never intended to refer specifically to any one particular mythical or legendary theme. Rather, language having various traditional catastrophic associations, both mythical and nonmythical, is used to portray in a few brief impressionistic strokes the most terrifying situations of danger and insecurity conceivable. These pictures function only as background for the main theme of the psalm, which is the security to be found in Yahweh.

---

[1] The obscure closing expression *^{c}al-mût* (*^{c}almût* in many mss. according to *BH*) is taken by Mowinckel, *Psalms*, I, 182, and Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, p. 81, as suggesting a mythical struggle against the god Mot. Weiser, *Psalms*, pp. 380, 383, tentatively translates "beyond death," but doubts that the words are original. But more plausible is either the view of Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 356, 360, that it is a misplaced word from the following psalm title (cf. Pss. 9:1; 46:1), or the LXX reading, *eis tous aiōnas* = *^{c}ôlāmôt*, as a synonymous parallel of *^{c}ôlām wā^{c}ed* of the preceding half line.

[2] Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 341. [3] Weiser, *Psalms*, pp. 365-374.

[4] So tentatively Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 340.

[5] Cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 346.

---

[1] Note the recurrence of the verbs *mwṭ* and *hmh*, vss. 3-4 and 7. Cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 342, 344, and Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 220-221.

[2] In other passages using similar imagery of cosmic collapse and nations in uproar sometimes one meaning and sometimes the other is apparent. Cf. for example Is. 17:12-13; 24:18b-20a; 54:10; Jer. 4:24; 5:22; 6:23; Hag. 2:6.

[3] There are resemblances to several of the many Old Testament passages which allude to the victory of Yahweh over the chaos dragon or to his confining the chaos waters. Cf. Pss. 18:16; 33:7; 74:13-14; 89:10-11; 104:9; Jer. 5:22; Is. 27:1; 51:9; Job 9:13; 38:8-11; Prov. 8:27-29. Most recent interpreters mention only the chaos rebellion and conflict motif rather than the judgment motif. So Weiser, *Psalms*, p. 368, Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 342, 344, and *Worship*, p. 203, Mowinckel, *Psalms*, I, 85, 87, 181. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 211, notes the ambiguity of the passage and concludes that the picture is primarily one of divine judgment though echoing mythical chaos conflict themes.

As the primary symbol of this security the psalm alludes to a somewhat more specific mythological tradition in the words *nāhār p^{e}lāgāyw y^{e}śamm^{e}ḥû-^{c}îr ʼ^{e}lôhîm* (vs. 5a). The picture of a marvelous fructifying stream flowing from Jerusalem and the symbolism implicit in it is elaborated in various ways in other Old Testament passages. In most cases the context shows that it is primarily a fertility symbol.[1] The cosmological character of this picture can be partly traced in Genesis 2:10-14 which depicts a river flowing out of Eden and dividing into four branches that water the whole earth. Here the picture is emptied of mythical elements and simply merges into an archaic and partly speculative geographical map of the world. Although this passage seems irrelevant to the main plot of Genesis 2, the significance of the river as a symbol of the divine source of the fertility of Eden and of the whole earth is clearly evident.[2]

However, a more definitely mythological Canaanite parallel occurs in the Ugaritic texts in the context of a stereotyped formula used several times in depicting the approach of other deities to the place of El for an audience with him.[1] These passages do not show clearly the mythological significance of the fact that El has his dwelling "at the source of the rivers in the middle of the streams of the two deeps." But two things point to the cosmic symbolism involved. One is the dual word *thmtm* cognate with Hebrew *t^{e}hôm* and Accadian *Ti'āmat*. The other is the probable meaning "world mountain" of the name *ḫršn* given to the place of El in two poorly preserved passages.[2] This supports Clements' conclusion that the dwelling place of El is the world mountain at the horizon where the waters above the sky and below the earth come together.[3] Thus the formula presupposes that El controls the flow of the cosmic waters which replenish the rain, the springs and the streams of the earth. The underlying fertility symbolism implicit in this picture is not developed in the contexts, perhaps because fertility symbolism in Ugaritic mythology is associated primarily with Baal and Anat and their conflicts with Mot and Yam. A cosmological picture very similar to this is presented in much fuller form, though largely devoid of genuinely mythological elements, in Job 38 where the function of watering the earth is clear.[1]

---

[1] Ps. 65:10; Ezek. 47:1-12; and perhaps Zech. 14:8; cf. Rev. 22:1-2. In one or two other cases it is, as here, a symbol of protection and security, Is. 33:21; and perhaps in part Zech. 14:8 (cf. vs. 11). This is probably a secondary connotation, however, as indicated by the word *y^{e}śamm^{e}ḥû* which probably still echoes the original fertility symbolism.

[2] Cf. von Rad, *Genesis*, pp. 77-78, and C. T. Fritsch, *Genesis* (LBC, 2; Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959), p. 29.

---

[1] The most perfectly preserved example depicts the approach of *aṯrt* to bring a request from *b^{c}l* on *ṣpn* that *il* authorize a palace to be built for him. The passage reads, *idk lttn pnm ^{c}m il mbk nhrm qrb apq thmtm tgly śd il wtbu qrš mlk ab šnm*, *UM*, 51:IV:20-24 (*ANET*, p. 133a). Almost the same formula occurs in 49:I:4-8 (*ANET*, p. 140a), 129:4-5 (*ANET*, 129b), *^{c}nt*:pl. vi:V:13-16 (*ANET*, p. 137b), 2 *Aqht*:VI:46-49 (*ANET*, p. 152a). In one passage where this formula occurs the place of *il* is further characterized in the words *y^{c}ny il bšb^{c}t ḥdrm bṯmnt ap sgrt*, *UM*, *^{c}nt*:pl. vi:V:33-35; cf. lines 19-20.

[2] Gordon reconstructs the one passage as follows: *idk lyt[n pnm ^{c}m lṯpn] il dpid tk brš[n ygly śd i[l wybu grš mlk] ab šnm*, *UM*, *^{c}nt*:pl. ix: III:21-24; cf. II:23. See Clements, *God and Temple*, p. 10, and G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, p. 139, for the meaning "world mountain."

[3] Clements, *God and Temple*, p. 10, rejects the view developed by M. H. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts* (SVT, 2; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955), that the dwelling place of *il* is in the watery underworld. On the relation of *thmtm* to Old Testament *t^{e}hôm* see briefly J. J. Jackson, "Deep, The," *IDB*, I, 813.

Psalm 46:5 does not develop this kind of cosmological picture. One must nevertheless assume a similar origin of the expression *nāhār pᵉlāgāyw*, even if it came to be associated secondarily with the Gihon spring used to irrigate the west slopes of the Kidron valley on the eastern side of the southwest hill of Jerusalem.[2] Equally important is the second half of the line, *qiddēš miškānô ᶜelyôn*, "Elyon sanctifies his dwelling place" (vs. 5b).[3] It has become clear that Canaanite religious themes probably entered into the religious synthesis of David and Solomon through assimilation of elements from a pre-Davidic Jebusite cult of El Elyon into the Yahwistic cult associated with the ark, temple and

---

[1] See especially vs. 16 where the terms *nibkê-yām* and *ḥēqer tᵉhôm* may be compared with the partly cognate Ugaritic expressions *mbk nhrm* and *apq thmtm*.

[2] So Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 71-72. Weiser, *Psalms*, p. 370, and Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 222, also accept the possibility of a secondary association with Gihon. Schmid, "Kulttraditionen," p. 187, accepts this identification with little hesitation. On the archaeology of the Gihon water system in Old Testament times see Barrois, "Siloam," pp. 252b-355a.

[3] Accepting the reading of the LXX which involves only a very slight emendation of the MT and gives a much more intelligible reading. As Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 339, points out, the plural of *miškān* is nearly always *miškānôt*. Also plausible is the suggestion of Schmid, "Kulttraditionen," pp. 182-183, that the yodh of *miškᵉnê* in the MT may be taken as so-called hireq compaginis rather than plural, thus giving a meaning similar to the LXX. Cf. Weiser, *Psalms*, p. 370, and *GK*, §90k-n.

Davidic dynasty.[1] Thus it is plausible to assume that the picture of *^{c}îr ʼ^{e}lôhîm* (City of God) as the *miškān* of Elyon watered and fructified by the branches of the cosmic stream derived from Jebusite mythology.[2]

Interestingly enough, however, the term City of God in Psalm 46:5 is not explicitly identified with Jerusalem or Zion, although every reader and interpreter makes this connection without hesitation. And undoubtedly the psalm itself intends this expression as a laudatory title for Jerusalem or Zion, just as Elyon functions as a laudatory title for Yahweh. But just as Elyon in Jebusite mythology could not originally have functioned as a title for Yahweh, so also there is no clear evidence that City of God functioned in Jebusite mythology as a title for Zion or Jerusalem. The close association of City of God with the phrase *nāhār p^{e}lāgāyw* and the poetic parallel which refers to it as the *miškān* of Elyon makes it likely that this was another Canaanite and presumably Jebusite designation for the cosmic dwelling place of Elyon. In this respect it would then be a synonym of *har-mô^{c}ēd b^{e}yark^{e}tê ṣāpôn*, which designates the cosmic dwelling place of Elyon in Isaiah 14:13.[3] Although Isaiah 14:12-15 provides us with the fullest example available of an Elyon myth, it gives no indication at all that his dwelling place was identified specifically with Zion or Jerusalem. The use made of this myth in Isaiah 14, and also the use made of the myth of the first man in Ezekiel 28, indicate instead that such "floating" mythological stories and themes had long since become dissociated from any specific cult or cult place. The varied uses of fragmentary mythological themes throughout the Old Testament indicates that the application to Zion-Jerusalem of mythology concerning the dwelling place of Elyon may be plausibly explained as a secondary corollary of the application of the title Elyon to Yahweh whose presence in Zion is symbolized by the ark.

---

[1] Chap. 4, §§B-E.

[2] So Schmid, "Kulttraditionen," p. 187, Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 344, Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 222.

[3] If Ezek. 28:12b-16 preserves part of another Jebusite Elyon myth it may provide two other possible designations of his dwelling place, *^{c}ēden gan-ʼ^{e}lôhîm* and *har qōdeš ʼ^{e}lôhîm* or *har-ʼ^{e}lôhîm*. If all these titles were interchangeable in Jebusite mythology, then the term *ʼ^{e}lôhîm* in some of them was probably a genuine plural since *har-mô^{c}ēd* implies a place of assembly for a polytheistic pantheon of deities.

The identification of the cosmic dwelling place of Elyon with Zion need not therefore be Jebusite in origin at all even though this is commonly assumed. For the sake of argument, however, one may grant that Jebusite mythology could have made this identification on the general principle that the local cult place is always identified symbolically with the cosmic dwelling place of the deity. This would explain the similar duality or vertical typology evident in this and other Old Testament allusions to Yahweh's dwelling place as being in the heavens and at the same time in Zion or the temple.[1] But this still does not demonstrate that the tradition of the so-called inviolability of Zion is primarily Jebusite in origin.[2] In the context of the Yahwistic temple cult the words of Psalm 46:6, *’^{e}lôhîm* *b^{e}qirbāh* *bal-timmôṭ*, referring back to the City of God in the preceding verse, can hardly have been understood in any other way than as an allusion to the ark in the temple as the symbol of Yahweh's protective presence. Even the word *miškān* (vs. 5), referring to the City of God as the dwelling place of Elyon, is a term whose associations elsewhere are with the ark and tabernacle traditions and Zion or the temple as the place of the ark.[1] Likewise the refrain (vss. 8,12), stating in a climactic way the basic theme of the psalm, uses the term *yhwh* *ṣ^{e}bā’ôt* whose traditional associations stemming from Shiloh are with the ark and holy war.[2]

---

[1] Clements, God and Temple, pp. 2-11, 47-48, argues that this principle was characteristic of Canaanite mythology and that it carried over into Israelite Zion and temple theology. This is stated as a general religio-historical principle by Eliade, Cosmos and History, pp. 6-21.

[2] The Jebusite origin of this tradition is argued especially by J. H. Hayes, "The Tradition of Zion's Inviolability," JBL, LXXXII (1963), 422-424, and is assumed by Kraus, Psalmen, I, 344, Schreiner, Sion-Jerusalem, pp. 223-224, and Clements, God and Temple, p. 71. In addition

---

to Pss. 46, 48 and 76 the main basis for this hypothesis is the saying, *lô’-tābô’* *hēnnâ* *kî* *’im-h^{e}sîr^{e}kā* *ha^{c}iw^{e}rim* *w^{e}happis^{e}ḥîm*, attributed to the Jebusites in II Sam. 5:6 and I Chr. 11:4 (only the words *lô’* *tābô’* *hēnnâ*) in the story of David's conquest of Jerusalem and the similar saying *lô’* *yābô’* *’el-hā^{c}îr* *hazzô’t* used twice in an oracle of Isaiah (Is. 37:33-34 = II Kgs. 19:32-33) promising that Yahweh will defend Jerusalem against the king of Assyria. In addition to the obscurity of the second half of the saying in II Sam. 5:6, the saying is cited almost in mockery of the false confidence of the Jebusites in their ability to defend the city in order to contrast this with the clever strategy of David in penetrating the city through the *ṣinnôr*. The passage does not imply in any way that the confidence of the Jebusites was based upon a belief in the divine protection or cultic inviolability of the city.

[1] The term *mšknt* occurs also in the Ugaritic *Aqht* texts referring to divine dwelling places, *UM*, 128:III:19 and 2 *Aqht*:V:32-33, in both cases as a synonymous parallel of *ahl* cognate with Hebrew *’ōhel*, "tent." But the Old Testament associations of the word are everywhere with traditional Israelite rather than borrowed Canaanite themes. Pss. 78:60 and 132:5,7 clearly show the use of the term as almost a technical designation of the place of the ark; cf. Pss. 26:8; 74:7; 43:3; 84:2. This technical use is further reflected in the Priestly account of the Mosaic tabernacle as the portable home of the ark, Ex. 25-31, 35-40, which partly reflects ideas associated with the Jerusalem temple. Cf. also Josh. 22:19 and II Sam. 7:6. See chap. 1, §G, and chap. 5, §A.

[2] See chap. 1, §D.

The condensed theophany statement in verse 7 confirms the connection of Psalm 46 with the holy war hymnic theophany tradition. Jeremias groups it with Judges 5:4-5; Psalm 68:8-9; Micah 1:3-4 and Amos 1:2, as representing the basic structure of the hymnic theophany *Gattung* in its most archaic form.[1] As in Amos 1:2 and Psalm 29:3-5, Yahweh's coming is indicated only in storm theophany imagery as thunder which shakes and devastates the earth, *nātan* *b^{e}qôlô* *tāmûg* *hā'āreṣ*.[2] This theophany intervention is Yahweh's response to the storming of the nations portrayed in imagery reminiscent of the uproar of the chaos waters, *hāmû* *gôyîm* *māṭû* *mamlākôt* (cf. vss. 3-4). This uproar represents the chaotic instability of the world depicted in sharp contrast to the security symbolized by Yahweh's presence in Zion affirmed in the preceding line. The uproar of the nations is not presented explicitly as an attack on Zion. In the light of Psalm 48:5-7, however, this may be implied. But again it is unnecessary to posit a pre-Israelite Zion *Völkersturm* tradition.[3] Instead the background must be sought in the holy war theophany tradition which is here universalized by the assimilation of Elyon cosmological conflict imagery.[4]

The last stanza of Psalm 46 (vss. 8-10) completes the picture of security in the face of the chaotic raging of the cosmos and the nations by introducing imagery clearly drawn from the traditional language of holy war. The picture of Yahweh carrying out the ritual of *ḥērem* in destroying the weapons of war recalls the hymnic recital in Psalm 48:5-8 of the legend-like story of Yahweh's defense of his city.[1] In Psalm 46, however, the allusion is even more brief and vague and need not depend on any specific tradition or historical event. Instead it evokes a holy war image in the same vague and generalizing way as the other images in the psalm are portrayed. It enlarges upon the preceding picture of the chaotic raging of the nations by pointing to Yahweh as the only source of security in the face of the extreme insecurity of war and battle. Indirectly it points to Zion in time of siege as the symbol of this security in a way somewhat analogous to the ritual procession around Zion in Psalm 48:13-14. But it universalizes the idea more explicitly by picturing Yahweh as destroying war itself from the earth as well as the weapons of war.[2] Thus the psalm as a whole reflects the association with Zion of traditional ideas originally associated with the ark and holy war and a blending of these with pictures deriving ultimately from Canaanite mythology. But these images in their vagueness and generality amount to an abstract universal confession of trust in Yahweh with Zion as the symbol of complete security in Yahweh in the face of what would otherwise be Israel's total insecurity in the world.

---

[1] Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 14, 126, 140.

[2] Cf. chap. 5, §F, Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 345, and Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, p. 84.

[3] Such a tradition is posited by Rohland, *Die Bedeutung der Erwählungstraditionen Israels*, pp. 131ff., as cited with tentative approval by von Rad, *Theology*, I, 46, II, 157, and Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 14, 126, 140. So also Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 344.

[4] Cf. Schmid, "Kulttraditionen," pp. 182-183.

---

[1] Compare the words *^{c}agālôt yiśrōp bā'ēš* (Ps. 46:10) with *w^{e}'et-mark^{e}bôteyhem śārap bā'ēš* (Josh. 11:6,9), telling of the ritual of burning the war chariots of the enemy at the command of Yahweh in the story of Joshua's holy war victory over Hazor. On the practice of *ḥērem* in connection with holy war see von Rad, *Heilige Krieg*, p. 13, and de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 260-261.

[2] This same general theme occurs again in Ps. 76:4. The picture of Yahweh destroying the weapons of war or putting an end to all warfare is presented more elaborately and in a variety of later contexts such as Ezek. 39:9-10; Is. 9:4; Hos. 2:20; and with less similarity, Is. 2:4 = Mic. 4:3; Is. 11:6-9.

E. Elements of Zion Symbolism in Psalms 50, 65, 84, 122, 149

The remaining psalms of probable pre-exilic origin in which Zion or Jerusalem occurs may be considered only briefly. Most of these probably stem from the later period of the monarchy. Representing several different psalm categories, they reflect in varying degrees one or another of the themes traditionally associated with Zion. This shows both the persistence of these themes and their tendency to permeate a variety of cultic usages.

Psalm 50 is a prophetic covenant lawsuit liturgy which Kraus tentatively dates to the time of Josiah's reform.[1] The entire psalm reflects an oracle delivered perhaps by a prophet associated with the ark as the symbol of cult theophany revelations.[2] The oracle announces a theophany centering at Zion in which Yahweh summons his people for judgment with heaven and earth as witnesses (vss. 1-6). The description reflects traditional fire and storm theophany imagery.[3] The verb *hôpîa*^{c} in particular is an archaic term associated with the storm theophany symbolism of the cherubim (Deut. 33:2; Pss. 80:2; cf. 94:1).[1] The honorific title, *miklal-yōpî*, "perfection of beauty," for Zion seems to depend simply upon its function as the place of Yahweh's theophany (cf. *k^{e}lîlat yōpî*, Lam. 2:15). The word Elyon occurs (vs. 14) with no clear mythical overtones unless *ʾēl ʾ^{e}lōhîm* (vs. 1) suggests the heavenly council.

---

[1] Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 374.

[2] On the background of this psalm as a covenant lawsuit mediated by a cult prophet see H. B. Huffmon, "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," *JBL*, LXXVIII (1959), 285-295, and Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 371-374, *Worship*, pp. 14, 111, 189, 197, 215-216. See chap. 1, §C.

[3] On the relation of this passage to the hymnic theophany *Gattung* see Jeremias, *Theophanie*, p. 64.

Psalm 149 is a hymn in which Israel and the "Sons of Zion" (vs. 2) celebrate or participate in a divinely given victory over the nations. There is nothing in the context to confirm the view of Kraus that this presupposes a tradition concerning the deliverance of Jerusalem from an attack by the nations.[2] More plausible is the view that it depicts a victory celebration in the sanctuary by a returning army.[3] But the most that can be said with confidence is that it celebrates Yahweh's kingship by portraying a universal holy war victory on behalf of his people. It echoes holy war themes associated with Zion but does not make Zion the symbol of victory. Thus it is only of marginal importance for purposes of this study.

Psalm 65 associates worship at Zion (vss. 2-5) with Yahweh's cosmic dominion portrayed in hymnic terms as the overcoming of the chaos waters and the rebellious nations (vss. 6-9). The imagery resembles that of Psalm 46:3-4 and the psalms of Yahweh's kingship, especially Psalm

---

[1] Cf. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 293. On Deut. 33:2 in comparison with Jud. 5:4-5 and Ps. 68:18 see chap. 1, §E, and chap. 4, §A. On Ps. 80:2 see chap. 4, §G. On the possible recurrence of *hôpîa^{c}* in the ancient dedicatory poem attributed to Solomon in connection with the installation of the ark in the temple, I Kgs. 8:12-13, see chap. 2, §D.

[2] Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 966.

[3] Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 207-208, citing Gunkel.

93:3-4.[1] But the context in Psalm 65 is a harvest thanksgiving hymn (vss. 10-14) in which traditional holy war theophany imagery hardly appears.

Psalm 84, a pilgrimage hymn praising Zion, dimly reflects ancient ark and tent themes in the word *mišk^{e}nôteykā*, referring to the sanctuary (vs. 2), and the recurrence of the divine title *yhwh* *ṣ^{e}bā'ôt* (vss. 2,4,9, 13).[2] Yahweh's strength (*^{c}ōz*, vs. 6) comes to the pilgrims from Zion (vss. 6-8). Their prayer for the king is closely connected with their entrance into the presence of Yahweh at Zion (vss. 8-10). The sanctuary is above all a symbol of security and joy in Yahweh's presence (vss. 2-5). Similarly Psalm 122, another pilgrimage hymn, praises Jerusalem as a symbol of security and the place where the Davidic king acts as judge (vss. 1-5).[3] As in Psalm 48, the fortifications of Jerusalem (*b^{e}'arm^{e}nôtā̆yik*, vs. 7) are themselves a symbol of security even to the pilgrim who does not dwell within them. But holy war, theophany and cosmological motifs are almost entirely lacking in Psalms 84 and 122.

F. Summary

Psalms 46, 48 and 76 present Zion itself as the symbol of Yahweh's holy war action without clear allusions to the ark, though probably presupposing its symbolism. At the heart of each one is an allusive and abbreviated portrayal of a battle in which the nations of the world are overcome by Yahweh in a direct theophany or holy war intervention.

---

[1] Cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 449-452.

[2] Cf. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 279.

[3] In support of MT, *šeḥubb^{e}râ*, "bound," rather than LXX, *metochē* = *šehebrâ*, "company," in vs. 3, see Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 284-285.

Psalm 76 stands closest to the premonarchic hymnic theophany tradition in that Elyon mythological themes are not apparent in it. Instead, somewhat like Psalm 68, it celebrates in hymnic fashion the imperial sway of Zion which existed during the age of David and Solomon. Using traditional hymnic theophany language, it depicts Yahweh's holy war intervention as taking place at Zion, the divinely chosen place of the ark. Unlike Psalms 2 and 110, it depicts Yahweh's power as acting directly, without reference to the Davidic king, to establish Yahweh's dominion over the nations. Thus Zion itself is the symbol of Yahweh exercising universal sovereignty by means of his holy war theophany power.

The laudatory titles for Zion in Psalm 48, especially *yark^{e}tê ṣāpôn* and *har qodsô*, show the assimilation of Canaanite Mountain-of-God terminology from Jebusite Elyon mythology. But the context gives little support to the view that an extensive Canaanite mythology was imported into the symbolism of Zion in connection with these terms. Emptied of explicit mythological features, they serve instead to glorify Zion as the symbol of Yahweh's holy war power in which the Zion cultic community finds security. Zion and its fortifications thus became the focal point for Israelite holy war themes of premonarchic origin associated with the ark. Though reciting a brief legend-like hymnic summary of a theophany holy war victory over the nations at Zion, the psalm uses this to present in a generalized way the theme of divine protection.

Psalm 46 shows a closer integration of Canaanite mythological conflict themes with Israelite holy war themes. Zion becomes the symbol of security, not just in the face of an enemy attack but also in the face of cosmic upheavals implying the utmost degree of insecurity. But Zion, depicted vaguely as the cosmic world mountain of Elyon, stands firm as the symbol of security which no chaotic power can shake. The demythologized cosmic conflict imagery serves to enhance and universalize the old holy war theophany themes associated with the ark at Zion. The incorporation of Canaanite cosmological themes introduces the same kind of vertical typology that was apparent in the psalms of Yahweh's kingship. Thus the psalm makes Zion the symbol of unlimited trust in Yahweh for security in the face of potential disaster and insecurity.

In both Psalms 46 and 48 cosmic mythological imagery seems to cluster primarily around the term City of God, whereas Zion or Mt. Zion is the focal point of holy war imagery. This results in the term Zion occurring in Psalm 48 with three distinct connotations. As Yahweh's dwelling place symbolized by the presence of the ark, it becomes, through the assimilation of mythical imagery, the earthly symbol of cosmic stability and security. As a fortified stronghold, its earliest traceable connotation, it symbolizes security and holy war protection in the face of military threat. But as a synonym of Jerusalem it also refers to the city and its inhabitants as the community which looks to Yahweh for security.

It is questionable whether one should speak of a doctrine of the "inviolability of Zion" on the basis of Psalms 46, 48 and 76. Zion is a place of divine security only in the sense that it points toward trust in Yahweh in the face of every conceivable threat and danger, especially war and enemy attack. Faith in a transcendent God must be symbolized by tangible and concrete models or cultic images which point to or embody some understanding of the conditions and possibilities of human existence. Zion in these psalms points to a condition of human existence in which the possibilities of disaster are unlimited. But in the face of the most frightening dangers it points toward the possibility of security through trust rather than through self-made forms of protection.

CHAPTER VII. ZION AS A SYMBOL OF FAITH FOR ISAIAH

The centrality of the temple symbolism in Isaiah's account of his call vision, together with his easy access to the king and other high officials reflected in various passages, indicates to this writer that he probably functioned as a temple official or cultic prophet, serving at the same time as a member of the king's council or advisory staff.[1] This study has repeatedly called attention to evidence that the ark was a traditional symbolic focal point for the reception of revelations and oracles of various kinds.[2] The possibility that Isaiah associated his reception of oracles with the symbolism of the Zion temple cult is indicated both by his call vision and by the story of him delivering Yahweh's answer after Hezekiah took the Assyrian ultimatum to the temple and appealed for deliverance in the presence of the ark and cherubim (II Kgs. 19:14-28 = Is. 37:14-29; cf. II Kgs. 19:1-7 = Is. 37:1-7).[3] In order to understand the significance of Zion for Isaiah one must study not only the passages where the word occurs but also other passages which make use of traditional Zion themes.

---

[1] The history of this hypothesis and the debates surrounding it cannot be treated here. Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," favors such a view, whereas von Rad, _Theology_, II, 52-53, 147, rejects the idea that Isaiah or any of the other important pre-exilic "writing" prophets were cultic functionaries. For a summary of various theories connecting Isaiah with the royal court and still another proposal see R. T. Anderson, "Was Isaiah a Scribe?" _JBL_, LXXIX (1960), 57-58.

[2] See chap. 1, §§C,E,G, chap. 2, §§A,E, and chap. 5, _passim_.

[3] This legend-like story probably indicates in a stereotyped and idealized way how such a transaction customarily took place. At least it reveals that, among those who formulated and transmitted the Isaiah stories and legends, he was pictured as acting in the traditional role of a charismatic cult prophet associated with the temple and royal court. The closest analogy is the account in II Sam. 7:2-4 of Nathan responding to David with an incubation oracle seemingly mediated by Yahweh whose presence was symbolized by the ark; cf. chap. 2, §E.

A. Zion Symbolism in Isaiah's Call Vision and Yahweh's Holy War Action against Israel

Isaiah 6 is formulated according to a traditional pattern for prophetic commission reports as appears from its close parallelism to the vision report of Micaiah ben Imlah in I Kings 22.[1] Both visions reflect traditional Canaanite-style imagery of Yahweh in the midst of his heavenly council. In the case of Isaiah, however, the vision of Yahweh on his exalted throne presupposes as its setting the temple and some cultic action involving the ark and cherubim as a throne symbol (vs. 1).[2] These point to his cosmic heavenly enthronement, thus revealing the same vertical typology noted in the psalms of Yahweh's kingship.[3] The *ś^{e}rāpîm*, possibly reflecting storm theophany symbolism, represent Yahweh's heavenly court (vss. 2-3).[4] Their hymnic chant with the title *yhwh ṣ^{e}bā'ôt* and the climactic emphasis on his *kābôd* filling the earth (vs. 3), recalls the combined holy war, theophany and kingship symbolism of the ark, especially as presented in Psalms 24:7-10 and 29.[1] The centrality of these themes in Isaiah 6 is further emphasized by the title *hammelek yhwh ṣ^{e}bā’ôt* in the summary recapitulation of the vision at the end of Isaiah's cry of woe (vs. 5).[2] The thunderous sound shaking the threshhold and the smoke filling the house (vs. 4) may reflect the climax of a processional entry of the ark into the sanctuary amidst clouds of incense, as in I Kings 8:6,10-11 where a cloud representing Yahweh's *kābôd* fills the temple when the ark is installed in the holy of holies.[3] The climax of the vision comes in verses 8-9 with the thunderous voice of Yahweh himself issuing from the throne in the midst of the heavenly

---

[1] For a comparison see H. Wildberger, *Jesaja* (BKAT, 10; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1965ff.) pp. 234-238.

[2] O. Procksch, *Jesaia I* (KAT; Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1930), pp. 53-57; cf. O. Kaiser, *Der Prophet Jesaja, Kapitel 1-12* (ATD, 17; 2. Aufl., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), pp. 58-59, and W. Vischer, *Die Immanuel-Botschaft im Rahmen des kôniglichen Zionsfestes* (Theologische Studien, 45; Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1955), pp. 13-14.

[3] Chap. 4; cf. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Jesaja*, I: *Kapitel 1-23* (ZB; 2. Aufl., Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1966), p. 95, and Harrelson, *Interpreting the Old Testament*, pp. 231-232.

[4] Procksch, *Jesaia I*, p. 54, followed by Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 208, suggests on the basis of the meaning "burning" or "fiery" of *śārāp* that they symbolized lightning, just as the cherubim symbolized the

---

thundercloud. Like the cherubim, the seraphim in Is. 6 are probably composite mythological creatures, partly human, partly birdlike, and perhaps partly serpent-like, having a fiery brightness; cf. Fohrer, *Jesaja*, I, 95-96. The close relationship of the seraphim to the cobra standing on its coil as an Egyptian royal symbol has been argued recently by K. R. Joines, "Winged Serpents in Isaiah's Inaugural Vision," *JBL*, LXXXVI (1967), 410-415.

[1] See above, chap. 1, §D, and chap. 4, §§D,F.

[2] See T. C. Vriezen, "Essentials of the Theology of Isaiah," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, pp. 131-132, who cites Isaiah's frequent use of the title *yhwh ṣ^{e}bā’ôt* and also his use of such titles as *hammelek* (6:5; cf. 30:33), *hā’ādôn* (1:24; 3:1; 10:16,33; 19:4; cf. Ex. 23:17; 34:23), and *’^{a}dôn kol-hā’āreṣ* (Josh. 3:11; 13; Ps. 97:5; Mic. 4:13; Zech. 4:14; 6:5), *’^{a}dônāy* (approximately twelve times though manuscripts vary), and *’^{a}bîr yiśrā’ēl* (1:24; cf. Gen. 49:24; Ps. 132:2,5), as all emphasizing Yahweh's glorious power.

[3] See chap. 2, §D. The picture is also reminiscent of the theophany symbolism of the ark and tabernacle tradition in P, cf. chap. 1, §G.

council as in Psalm 29.[1] This implies that Isaiah is initiated into Yahweh's royal court and thereby commissioned as Yahweh's messenger to his people.[2] Thus the entire vision report validates Isaiah's status and authority as Yahweh's spokesman and authenticates his message. The oracles reported in verses 9-12 contain an unrelieved message of doom, excluding even the possibility of repentance and making Isaiah's own words the instruments of destruction.[3] Thus Isaiah 6 says in effect that Yahweh's thunderous word issuing from Yahweh's throne in Zion through the oracles of Isaiah is about to bring punishment, doom and destruction upon Israel. This conclusion that Isaiah is the mediator of Yahweh's word issuing specifically from Zion is confirmed in the autobiographical statement announcing his withdrawal from public life and leaving his testimony with his disciples (Is. 8:16-18). Here he stresses emphatically that his entire prophetic function and message derive *mē^{c}im* *yhwh* *ṣ^{e}bā'ôt* *haššōkēn* *b^{e}har* *siyyôn* (vs. 18), a saying which reflects his dependence on traditions deriving ultimately from the Shiloh ark and tent sanctuary.[4]

---

[1] The expression *qôl* *'^{a}dônāy*, or according to some mss. *qôl* *yhwh*, in Is. 6:8 recalls the repeated occurrence of *qôl* *yhwh* in the Canaanite thunderstorm theophany language of Ps. 29 where Yahweh as *'ēl-kābôd* summons the *b^{e}nê* *'ēlîm* to acknowledge his *kābôd* *wā^{c}ōz*; cf. above, chap. 4, §F.

[2] Cf. Wildberger, *Jesaja*, p. 236.

[3] Vriezen, "Theology of Isaiah," pp. 133, 137. Despite the offensive harshness of vss. 9-12 their curselike implications must not be rationalized away; cf. von Rad, *Theology*, II, 151-155, and A. F. Key, "The Magical Background of Isaiah 6:9-13," *JBL*, LXXXVI (1967), 198-204. The obscurity of vs. 13 is such that it is unsafe to derive from it any certain allusion to the idea of a remnant; cf. Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 212-213.

[4] See the use of the verb *škn* in I Kgs. 8:12-13 discussed in chap. 2, §D, and in Jer. 7:12 referring to Yahweh's name "dwelling" in Shiloh. Note also the remarks on *miškān*, chap. 1, §G, which refers to the Shiloh sanctuary in Ps. 78:60.

A precedent for this theme occurs in the similar picture of Yahweh's voice issuing from Zion with destructive power in the introductory keynote oracle in Amos 1:2. This represents a traditional theme, as indicated by the occurrence of the first line of the saying in Joel 4:16 and, with slight variation, in Jeremiah 25:30.[1] Although there is no convincing evidence that Amos was personally connected with the Jerusalem cult, this oracle reflects the ancient storm theophany tradition which had come to be associated with the ark and cherubim in the Jerusalem cult, deriving from the premonarchic holy war victory song style.[2] But in Amos this traditional theme is transformed into an ominous threat.[3] Thus both Amos and Isaiah reverse the theme expressed in Psalms 29 and 46:7,9-11 of Yahweh giving security to Zion as the place of his sanctuary when his voice issues forth to devastate the earth and to establish his sovereignty through a marvelous victory.[4] Instead of security, Yahweh's victorious theophany manifestation means disaster as if he were making war from Zion against his own people as implied in Isaiah 6:11. Thus Isaiah, like Amos, interprets the military disasters of his day as holy war actions directed by Yahweh from Zion against his own people and carried out through the instrumentality of enemy nations. This is confirmed by Isaiah 28:21 which compares Yahweh's devastation of Jerusalem explicitly with his devastation of Israel's enemies in the holy war victories of David.

---

[1] Lindblom, *Prophecy*, pp. 116-117, stresses the cultic and liturgical background of the saying. That this is an ancient formula adopted by Amos is argued by J. M. Myers, *Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah* (LBC, 14; Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959), p. 104.

[2] N. W. Porteous, "The Prophets and the Problem of Continuity," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, pp. 18-19. Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 12-14, 16-17, 130-132, regards Am. 1:2 as representing form-critically a very archaic form of the theophany tradition. Against the theory, based on the word *nôqēd* in Am. 1:1 and *rb khnm rb nqdm* as the title of a leading Ugaritic cultic official (*UM*, 62:54-55), that Amos was also such a cultic official see Bentzen, *Introduction*, II, 139; cf. O. Eissfeldt, "The Prophetic Literature," *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, pp. 123-124, 159.

[3] Elaborations of the imagery of Yahweh roaring from Zion in Am. 1:2 occur in 3:4,8 where its threatening character is made explicit. The underlying storm theophany imagery of Am. 1:2 is evident in the similar language of Job. 37:4.

[4] On Ps. 46 see above chap. 6, §D. The words *nātan b^{e}qôlô*, Ps. 46:7, and *yittēn qôlô*, Am. 1:2 = Joel 3:16 (cf. Jer. 25:30), reflect the same traditional picture of Yahweh's voice issuing with destructive

When one turns to Isaiah's many reproach and threat oracles, Jerusalem or Zion is not sharply distinguished from Judah or Israel as the object of Yahweh's accusations and wrath. Some oracles seem to focus upon Israel as Yahweh's people, or upon its leaders, without any more precise definition though Jerusalem or Judah may often be meant (Is. 1:3,4; 2:6; 3:13-15; 5:25; 6:10; 29:13-14). In at least one case, Judah and Israel are referred to together (5:7; cf. 8:14). Sometimes Jerusalem is referred to along with Judah (3:1,8; 5:3; 22:21; cf. 8:14; 22:21). In still other cases Israel, Ephraim or Samaria is referred to alone (9:7, 13; 10:22; 17:4; 28:1,3), or in combination with Aram or Damascus (7:8-9; 8:4). Elsewhere Jerusalem alone is indicated (Is. 1:21; 22:9-10; 28:14). When the word Zion occurs in the contexts of reproaches or threats it seems usually to refer to the city or its inhabitants without special reference to its sacral significance (1:8; 3:16-17; 10:32; cf. 28:16).

---

power from his earthly, and at the same time his cosmic, throne as do the expressions *qôl yhwh*, Ps. 29, and *qôl ’^{a}dônāy*, Is. 6:8. Compare also *w^{ē}hā’^{a}dāmâ tisšā’eh š^{e}māmâ*, Is. 6:11, with *’^{a}šer-śām šammôt bā’āreṣ*, Ps. 46:9, as a further point of contact with traditional themes.

Thus it cannot be said that Isaiah subscribed to a dogmatic belief in the inherent inviolability of Zion or that he separated its fate arbitrarily from that of Judah and Israel as a whole.[1]

B. Isaiah's Concept of Trust and His First Confrontation with Ahaz, Isaiah 7:1-9

Despite these negative implications Isaiah also attached special importance to the Davidic king and to Zion as the traditional symbols of Yahweh's holy war deliverance. Indeed, he interpreted these traditional themes in such a radical way as to alienate himself from Ahaz, perhaps also contributing to the alienation of Ahaz from the traditional Yahwism of the temple cult. The story and oracles in Isaiah 7:1-17 stemming from Isaiah's encounters with Ahaz at the time of the invasion of Judah by Israel and Syria in 734 depict one or more encounters which occurred during the crisis period when Ahaz was in the process of devising emergency defense plans to meet the threat (vss. 2-3).

In the first of these encounters, narrated in Isaiah 7:1-9, Isaiah's son, bearing the symbolic name š^{e}’ār yāšûb (Shear Jashub, vs. 3), is certainly intended as a portentous sign reinforcing the point of the accompanying oracle, even though the significance of the name is not explained or referred to in the context. As an "embryonic" oracle the name Shear Jashub was capable of expansion either into a threat (Is.

---

[1] On this point see also the argument of Vriezen, "Theology of Isaiah," pp. 138-141. S. H. Blank, Prophetic Faith in Isaiah (New York: Harper & Bros., 1958), pp. 2-4, 9-11, emphasizes the point that Isaiah totally rejected the idea of the inviolability of Jerusalem and announced its coming destruction in shocking imagery.

10:22-23) or into a promise (Is. 10:20-21).[1] The expansion into a threat, preserved in Isaiah 10:22-23, may be the explanatory oracle delivered originally in connection with the naming of the son and addressed primarily to the Northern Kingdom as indicated by the word Israel.[2] This oracle based on the words *š^{e}'ār yāšûb* has more the character of a lament than a threat.[3] Since it makes no reference to the circumstances of the Syro-Ephraimitic war, it may reflect an earlier situation such as the initial submission of Menahem to Assyria or the initial rebellion of Pekah against Assyrian suzerainty. Thus as a sign to Ahaz during the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis, Shear Jashub represented assurance rather than a threat, agreeing with and confirming the oracle Isaiah has come to deliver. Its meaning and function in this situation is thus similar to the interpretation placed upon the symbolic name *mahēr šālāl ḥāš baz* given by Isaiah to another son during this same crisis (Is. 8:1-4).[1]

---

[1] On the characteristics and function of this and other "embryonic" oracles in the development of full-fledged prophetic oracles see Scott, "Isaiah's Oracles," pp. 185-186, and "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 155, 215, 224-225.

[2] Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 244, regards 10:22-23 as an oracle delivered in connection with the naming of the son but believes it is probably addressed to Ahaz (cf. *^{c}amm^{e}kā*, vs. 22). However Isaiah composed a number of major oracles against the Northern Kingdom during the period of Assyrian expansion under Tiglath-pileser III and the Syro-Ephraimitic war (Is. 8:4; 9:7-21 + 5:25-30; 28:1-4) which supports the same meaning of the word Israel here. Furthermore, the symbolic name of his second son is explicitly directed against Israel (8:1-4). The tendency of many commentators such as Gray, *Isaiah*, I, 202-204, Fohrer, *Jesaja*, I, 160, Kaiser, *Jesaja 1-12*, pp. 117-118, and W. Eichrodt, *Der Heilige in Israel: Jesaja 1-12* (Die Botschaft des Alten Testaments, 17:1; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1960), pp. 130-131, to regard 10:22-23 as unauthentic arises from a failure to notice that it has been included at this point simply on the basis of the catchword *š^{e}'ār* (vss. 19,20,21, 22) even though it has no inner connection with the context. The earliness of the oracle is confirmed by the similarity of 10:23 to 6:12.

[3] According to W. E. Müller, *Die Vorstellung vom Rest im Alten Testament* (Borsdorf-Leipzig: Hoppe, 1939), as cited by von Rad, *Theology*, II, 21-22, the word *š^{e}'ār* referred originally to refugees who had managed to escape in a war or battle of annihilation. Since such a remnant might manage to keep alive a nation's hope of revival after defeat, the oracular saying *š^{e}'ār yāšûb* could easily be reinterpreted in terms of a promise as in Is. 10:20-21. On the conditional character of the threat implied in these words see Kaiser, *Jesaja 1-12*, p. 66, and H. W. Wolff, *Frieden ohne Ende: Eine Auslegung von Jes. 7:1-17 und 9:1-6* (Biblische Studien, 35; Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1962), pp. 17-18, who however see it as directed against Ahaz and Judah.

In conformity with this meaning of Shear Jashub, Isaiah's words to Ahaz (vss. 4-9) offer a promise of deliverance combined with exhortation and a warning in the form of a conditional threat.[2] Von Rad has shown that the exhortation in verse 4a and the conditional threat in verse 9b represent a radical restatement of the ancient holy war ideology and tradition.[3] The imperative *hiššāmēr* (vs. 4) occurs usually in warnings against violating divine commands and cultic or covenant regulations.[4] The word *hašqēṭ* (vs. 4) seems to imply a renunciation of all efforts at self-deliverance and total reliance on Yahweh for victory as implied in the ancient holy war formula *'al-tîrā'* here reinforced by *l^{e}bāb^{e}kā* *'al-yērak*.[1] In Isaiah 30:15 *hašqēṭ* occurs in series with other infinitival nouns, *šûbâ*, *naḥat* and *biṭḥ̮â*, describing the true way of deliverance and strength in a compact saying which Scott regards as another embryonic oracle perhaps dating from as early as the time of Ahaz.[2] As cited here it is placed in explicit contrast to Judah's futile decision to depend upon war horses (30:16).

---

[1] On this passage and its setting see Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 222-223, and Kaiser, *Jesaja 1-12*, pp. 80-81. Isaiah later applied this oracular name to Assyria's threat against Jerusalem, as evident in 10:6. But contrary to the view of Blank, *Prophetic Faith in Isaiah*, pp. 30-32, this is no evidence that 8:4 is mistaken in indicating that Isaiah originally interpreted the oracle as a threat against Israel and thus as a word of assurance to Judah during the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis.

[2] The formal structure of the oracle or oracles may be analyzed using the terminology adopted by R. B. Y. Scott, *The Relevance of the Prophets* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944), p. 101, and "Isaiah's Oracles," pp. 175, 182-183. Verse 3 is a private oracle to Isaiah introducing the oracle to Ahaz in vss. 4-9. The oracle to Ahaz consists of an exhortation (vss. 4-6), followed by a promise (vss. 7-9a, probably omitting 8b as a gloss), and ending on a warning note with a conditional threat (vs. 9b).

[3] Von Rad, *Heilige Krieg*, pp. 56-58, and *Theology*, II, 158-160; cf. Wolff, *Frieden ohne Ende*, pp. 18-20.

[4] Gen. 31:24,29; Ex. 19:12; 23:13,21; 34:12; Deut. 2:4; 12:13,19;

The closing line of the oracle in Isaiah 7:4-9, *'im* *lô'* *ta'^{a}mînû* / *kî* *lô'* *tē'āmēû* (vs. 9b), with its well known play on the verb *'mn*, is another embryonic oracle having essentially the same meaning as the one in 30:15 though there is no verbal correspondence.[3] However, Isaiah 7:9b does have a close verbal contact with still another key embryonic saying,

---

15:9; 24:8; Jud. 13:4,13; Jer. 17:21; Mal. 2:15-16. It warns against violating holy war rules in I Sam. 21:5, and against apostasy in general in Deut. 4:9,15,23; 6:12; 8:11; 11:16; 12:30; cf. Josh. 23:11.

[1] On the occurrence of *'al-tîrā'* with its demand for unconditional trust in Yahweh in holy war see von Rad, *Heilige* *Krieg*, pp. 9-10, who cites Ex. 14:13; Deut. 20:3; Josh. 8:1; 10:8,25; 11:6; Jud. 7:3; I Sam. 23:16; 30:6; II Sam. 10:12. This expression is combined similarly with *'al-yērak* *l^{e}babkem* in Deut. 20:3 (cf. Jer. 51:46), further confirming the traditional character and background of the language.

[2] The importance of this saying in the later Isaianic tradition is shown by the allusion to it in Is. 32:17. The context, Is. 30:8-17 is an oracle which probably summarized Isaiah's warnings in connection with his compilation of oracles denouncing Judah's alliance with Egypt against Sennacherib. So Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 159, 330-333, and Bright, "Isaiah--I," §442d.

[3] On Is. 7:9b and 30:15bc as embryonic oracles see Scott, "Isaiah's Oracles," p. 186, and "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 155, 216, 332-333.

hamma'ᵃmîn *lô'* *yāḥîš* (Is. 28:16), which Isaiah represents symbolically as the completely reliable, divinely established foundation stone of Zion. This saying, almost synonymous in meaning with both 7:9b and 30:15, is cited by way of contrast in the context of an oracle against the attempt to find security in a covenant with *môt* and *šᵉ'ôl* (Is. 28:14-22). This is probably a bitter, satirical way of characterizing Hezekiah's alliance with Egypt as a diabolical and futile covenant with the Canaanite god of death and destruction.[1] The meaning of the oracle as a whole is essentially the same as that of two other oracles against the alliance with Egypt, which likewise represent it as a futile turning away from Yahweh (Is. 30:1-7 and 31:1-3).

The niphal *yē'āmēnû* as used in 7:9b may reflect the traditional language of Nathan's oracle where the niphal participles *ne'ᵉmān* and *nākôn* express the divine promise of the permanent endurance of the Davidic kingship and throne.[2] Elsewhere *ne'ᵉmān* is used in contexts closely connecting the endurance of the Davidic dynasty with divinely given holy war victory.[1] Isaiah himself uses the expression *qiryâ ne'^{e}mānâ* as an honorific title for Zion in the context of a reproachful lament and threat oracle which envisages a purging and restoration of the city through divine judgment (Is. 1:21-26). Here it occurs in close contextual proximity with other honorific expressions, *m^{e}lē'^{a}tî mišpāṭ* and *ṣedeq yālîn bāh̩* (vs. 21), and *^{c}îr haṣṣedeq* (vs. 26), recalling traditional themes associated with Yahweh's kingship as symbolized by the ark and cherubim (Ps. 97:2) and with the Davidic dynasty (Ps. 89:15; cf. Is. 9:6; 11:4).[2] The traditional character and holy war overtones of the saying in Isaiah 7:9b are confirmed by the recurrence of the same play on *'mn* niphal and hiphil in a summons to faith attributed to Jehoshaphat before entrance into a great holy war battle in II Chronicles 20:20.[3]

---

[1] There is a difference of opinion on how literally to take this reference to a covenant with *môt* and *šᵉ'ôl*. Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 317, takes it quite literally. However G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Jesaja, II: Kapitel 24-39* (ZB; Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1962), 56-58, shows that it is more plausible to regard it as a figurative way of representing the foreign alliance as apostasy to alien gods. Bright, "Isaiah--I," §440e, tries to combine both views by suggesting that the reference is to the invocation of pagan gods in the treaty with Egypt.

[2] II Sam. 7:16; cf. I Kgs. 8:26; 11:38; I Chr. 17:23; II Chr. 1:9; 6:17. The connection of Is. 7:9b with Nathan's oracle has been pointed out by E. Würthwein, "Jesaja 7:1-9: Ein Beitrag zum Thema Prophetie und Politik," *Theologie als Glaubenswagnis: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Karl Heim* (Hamburg: Furche-Verlag, 1954), pp. 47-63, as cited by Wolff, *Frieden ohne Ende*, p. 24. On the root *'mn* in general in Isaiah see A. Weiser, "*Pisteuō*, *pistis*, etc." §B, "Der at.liche Begriff," *TWNT*, VI (1959), 189-190. On the importance of the whole family of *'mn* words in the Davidic dynastic tradition see Vischer, *Die Immanuel-Botschaft*, pp. 18-19. On the over-all traditional background of Isaiah's concept of

The oracle as a whole in Isaiah 7:4-9 seems to promise unconditionally that Yahweh himself will defeat and overthrow Rezin and Pekah

---

faith and his use of *he'^{e}mîn* see G. H. Davies, "The Yahwistic Tradition in the Eighth-Century Prophets," *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, pp. 45-51. On the connection between Isaiah's sayings on faith and the holy war traditions see von Rad, *Theology*, II, 159-161. Vriezen, "Theology of Isaiah," p. 136, points out that, in addition to the verb *'mn* Isaiah uses a whole series of other words to express the idea of absolute and unconditional trust in Yahweh as over against false kinds of trust, *bṭh̩* qal (30:15; contrast 30:12; 31:1; 32:9-11), *š^{c}n* niphal (10:20b; contrast 10:20a; 30:12; 31:1), *qwh* piel (8:17), *hkh* piel (8:17; 30:18), *šqṭ* qal (7:4; 30:15), *nwh̩* hiphil, *nah̩at*, *m^{e}nûh̩â* (28:12; 30:15).

[1] I Sam. 25:28; Ps. 89:29,38, the last of which is again in synonymous parallelism with *kwn* niphal.

[2] On these connections see Wildberger, *Jesaja*, p. 9.

[3] On II Chr. 20:1-30 as a holy war story see von Rad, *Heilige Krieg*, pp. 80-81.

because of their decision to attack Jerusalem and overthrow the Davidic king.[1] But, in return, it asks Ahaz and the entire nation to trust unconditionally in this promise and in the divine assurance of deliverance traditionally associated with the Davidic dynasty and covenant. Although the promised overthrow of Rezin and Pekah is unconditional, the endurance of Ahaz, Jerusalem and Judah is conditioned upon unswerving trust. The oracle is directed not only against the hasty attempts to prepare the military defenses of the city, but probably even more against the panic-stricken decision to appeal to Assyria for aid (II Kgs. 16:5-9).

C. The Relation of the Immanuel Sign to the David and Zion Traditions, Isaiah 7:10-17

Isaiah 7:10-17 represents a continuation of the prophetic narrative of verses 1-9 and confirms the inferences drawn from it. Whether reflecting a second encounter with Ahaz or a continuation of the same encounter, the second incident seems to be presented as a final and climactic attempt to influence Ahaz in the face of his inclination to reject Isaiah's promise of deliverance and the corresponding demand for unconditional trust. Since the basis for Isaiah's message in the first incident is the assurance of holy war deliverance from enemies associated with the traditions of the Davidic dynasty and Zion, presumably the second incident should be interpreted in the same light.

---

[1] The clearest and most plausible interpretation of the uncertain syntax of vss. 7-8a,9a is that of M. Saebø, "Formgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu Jesaja 7:3-9," *Studia Theologica*, XIV (1960), 61, as adopted by Kaiser, *Jesaja 1-12*, pp. 68, 74, and Wolff, *Frieden ohne Ende*, pp. 9, 21. Saebø regards the *kî* clause in vss. 8a,9a as the subject of *lô' tāqûm* *w*^{e}*lô' tihyeh* in vs. 7b. Kaiser translates:

7b Es wird nicht Bestand haben und nicht (mehr) sein,
8a dass Damaskus das Haupt Arams ist
und Rezin das Haupt von Damaskus, . . .
9a und Samaria das Haupt Ephraims
und der Remaljasohn das Haupt Samarias!

Yahweh's invitation mediated by Isaiah to Ahaz to ask for a sign (vss. 10-11) is in line with the invitation in Psalm 2:8 for the king, as Yahweh's adopted son installed on Mt. Zion, to ask for divinely given victory and world dominion (cf. Pss. 20:5; 21:3,5).[1] Isaiah's sharp reply interprets Ahaz's refusal to ask for a sign as a decisive abandonment of faith in Yahweh alienating him from the Davidic covenant.[2] Nevertheless, the Immanuel sign announced in verse 14 must be interpreted first of all as a promise rather than a threat. The closest analogy to the nominal sentence *ᶜimmānû ’ēl* is *yhwh sᵉbā’ôt ᶜimmānû* in the refrain in Psalm 46:8,12 in a context which uses Canaanite mythological imagery to enhance the picture of Zion as the symbol of Yahweh's protection in dependence upon the holy war symbolism of the ark.[3] The traditional holy war background and connotations of the saying are even more clear in Judges 6:11-16 where the expressions *ᶜimmᵉkā* and *ᶜimmānû* occur repeatedly in the story of the angel promising Gideon that Yahweh will be with him to give victory over the Midianites and deliver Israel. A further similarity is the granting of a confirmatory sign to Gideon (Jud. 6:17-24). Equally illuminating in the context of the holy war instructions of Deuteronomy 20:1-9 is the exhortation to trust Yahweh based on the promise of divine aid expressed in the words *’al-yērak l^{e}babkem ’al-tîr^{e}’û w^{e}’al-taḥp^{e}zû w^{e}’al-ta’arṣû mipp^{e}nêhem kî yhwh ’^{e}lôhêkem hahôlēk ^{c}immākem l^{e}hillāḥēm lākem ^{c}im-’ôy^{e}bêkem l^{e}hôšîa^{c} ’etkem* (vss. 3b-4). This exhortation also resembles Isaiah's exhortation to Ahaz in Isaiah 7:4 discussed above.[1] A similar exhortation and promise playing upon the word *^{c}im* is placed in the mouth of Hezekiah in the Chronicler's story of his preparations to defend Jerusalem against Sennacherib (II Chr. 32:7-8). The symbolic name Immanuel also echoes language associated with the traditions of the Davidic dynasty as seen in such expressions as *wā’ehyeh ^{c}imm^{e}kā* in Nathan's dynastic oracle (II Sam. 7:9; cf. I Kgs. 1:37; 11:38), *yādî tikkôn ^{c}immô* and *we’^{e}mûnātî w^{e}ḥasdî ^{c}immô* in a royal lament (Ps. 89:22,25), and perhaps *bêtî ^{c}im-’ēl kî b^{e}rît ^{c}ôlām śām lî* in the so-called "last words of David" (II Sam. 23:5).[2] The promise in Isaiah 7:16 that the land of the two invading kings will be deserted before the child can reject evil and choose good is thus an immediate and direct application of the tradition of holy war deliverance associated with Zion and the Davidic dynasty and symbolized in the name Immanuel. A further extension of this meaning is evident in the oracle fragment in Isaiah

---

[1] For this connection see H. Donner, *Israel unter den Völkern* (SVT, 11; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964), pp. 15-16, who also cites I Kgs. 3:5.

[2] This is perhaps the reason for the shift from *’ᵉlôheykā* "your God" (vs. 11) to *’ᵉlohay* "my God" (vs. 13). So Wolff, *Frieden ohne Ende*, pp. 28-31; similarly Fohrer, *Jesaja*, I, 112-113.

[3] The importance of Ps. 46:8,12 and the other passages mentioned here for interpreting *ᶜimmānû ’ēl* is emphasized by Wolff, *Frieden ohne Ende*, pp. 42-43. The preposition *ᶜim* in the predicate with Yahweh as subject is of such frequent occurrence that only the most directly relevant examples can be mentioned here. But a scanning of passages listed in Mandelkern, *Concordantiae*, II, 881-885, reveals numerous examples referring to divine help or guidance and none directly expressing a threat.

---

[1] On the holy war theme in Deut. 20:1-9 see G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*, tr. D. Barton (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), pp. 131-132, *Heilige Krieg*, pp. 70-72, and *Studies in Deuteronomy*, pp. 51-52.

[2] Vischer, *Die Immanuel-Botschaft*, pp. 21-23.

8:9-10 threatening the nations with defeat and concluding with the assurance *kî ᶜimmānû ʾēl* as the basis of the failure of their planned attack.[1]

The significance of the other elements in Isaiah 7:14-15 is much less clear. However the words *hinnēh hāᶜalmâ hārâ wᵉyôledet bēn wᵉqārāʾt šᵉmô* ... (vs. 14) are in the traditional style of legendary divine annunciations of momentous births as exemplified by Genesis 16:11, and Judges 13:5a,7a (cf. vs. 3).[2] It can hardly be coincidental that a similarly worded annunciation, *hl ǵlmt tld b[n*, occurs in a Ugaritic mythological text, sometimes called the *nkl* text, referring to a goddess or woman whose identity is not clear.[3] All this makes it likely that Isaiah 7:14-15 represents a fragmentary allusion to some familiar mythological or legendary story or perhaps to an already existing royal oracle the full content of which cannot be determined.[4] The reference to the child eating milk and honey for the first few years of his life may point to some kind of marvellous or paradise-like nourishment, thus confirming the mythological character of the allusions.[1] In the light of the tendency of the Jerusalem cult tradition, as reflected in the royal psalms, to apply such mythological imagery to the Davidic king, the most plausible identification of the child in Isaiah 7:14-15 is as a son of Ahaz and dynastic successor, possibly Hezekiah.[2]

---

[1] Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 224-225, also includes vs. 8b and its reference to Immanuel in this passage. But this is uncertain.

[2] Note that even the same somewhat unusual syntactical sequence--*hinnēh* with predicate adjective *hārâ*, participle *wᵉyôledet bēn*, and perfect consecutive *wᵉqārāʾt šᵉmô*--occurs both in Is. 7:14 and Gen. 16:11 and partially in Jud. 13:5a,7a, probably representing a fixed and traditional archaism. In contrast, Jud. 13:3 *wᵉhārît wᵉyāladt bēn* (perfects consecutive) represents a less archaic rendering of the same formula.

[3] *UM*, 77:7; cf. C. H. Gordon, "ᶜAlmah in Isaiah 7:14," *Journal of Bible and Religion*, XXI (1953), 106, E. R. Lacheman, "Apropos of Isaiah 7:14," *Journal of Bible and Religion*, XXII (1953), 43, and Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, pp. 24, 124-125. Gordon reconstructs the partly obliterated second word of line 5 to yield a synonymous parallel, *tld btl[t*. But Driver reconstructs quite differently, *tld bn l[n]h*. This and other textual and interpretative obscurities make hazardous any far-reaching conclusions based on comparisons of this passage with Is. 7:14.

[4] The awkward and seemingly illogical connection between vss. 15 and 16 is best explained on the assumption that vs. 15 continues the citation of the legend, myth or dynastic oracle introduced in vs. 14, whereas

More important than the character of the mythological allusions and the identification of the woman and child, however, are the interpretations Isaiah places upon the sign, the various elements of which function similarly to other "embryonic" oracles previously noted. The first and most immediate interpretation in verse 16 reaffirms the unconditional promise that the lands of the two invading kings will be devastated.

---

vs. 16 introduced by kî is Isaiah's own interpretation of it as a sign; cf. Eichrodt, Der Heilige in Israel, p. 90, and Harrelson, Interpreting the Old Testament, p. 237. This is more satisfactory than reversing the sequence of vss. 15 and 16 with Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 220, or omitting vs. 15 entirely with other interpreters such as Donner, Israel unter den Völkern, pp. 8-9, and Blank, Prophetic Faith in Isaiah, pp. 17-18. In order to maintain his view that Isaiah was unambiguously a prophet of doom Blank, pp. 15-35, has to perform frequent, radical and unjustifiable critical surgery on Is. 7 in which he finds two completely contradictory stories interwoven, one a later prophetic legend erroneously picturing Isaiah as promising deliverance in an unambiguous way, and the other, historically accurate, proclaiming doom in an equally unambiguous way.

[1] On this point and on the mythological parallels to this passage in general see Mowinckel, He That Cometh, pp. 112-114; cf. Eichrodt, Der Heilige in Israel, pp. 90-91.

[2] This identification is accepted by C. R. North, "Immanuel," IDB, II, 687, Bright, "Isaiah--I," §428a, M. Buber, The Prophetic Faith, tr. C. Witton-Davies (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960), pp. 139-140, and tentatively Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 219. For a survey of various alternative viewpoints see Donner, Israel unter den Völkern, pp. 16-18.

Since there is no indication of human agency, this implies an unmediated divine deliverance. The child Immanuel is not the deliverer but only the sign that the deliverance is Yahweh's act. Without any kind of transition verse 17 pronounces judgment upon Ahaz. Thus by implication Ahaz's lack of faith, though it cannot nullify the fulfillment of the sign, nevertheless nullifies its effect as deliverance by bringing devastation upon himself and his people from another source.[1]

The fearful panic of Ahaz and the nation made clear to Isaiah that disaster and divine judgment were inescapable and led to his final alienation from Ahaz and his withdrawal from public life into the private company of his sons and circle of disciples to await vindication of his message to Ahaz (8:11-15,16-18).[2] At the same time, however, Ahaz's rejection of Isaiah's demands may have alienated him not only from Isaiah but also from the Davidic and Zion traditions as a whole which Isaiah represented. The Kings account of Ahaz's appeal to Assyria and his subsequent cultic innovations seems to stress the point that he acted on his own initiative in both respects (II Kgs. 16:5-16). His "apostasy" may have been, therefore, not only an unavoidable political requirement of his vassal relationship to Assyria but also a conscious, clear-cut rejection of the unconditional trust in Yahweh and the dynastic covenant demanded by Isaiah. Other acts ascribed to Ahaz, especially the offering of his own son as a sacrifice perhaps also during the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis, suggest that his decision to reject Isaiah's message represented a complete disillusionment with traditional Yahwism and a wholehearted resort to alien and pagan cults, as charged in II Kings 16:3-4 and II Chronicles 28:2b-4,22-25. Indeed, the very decision to initiate a vassal relationship with Assyria against the counsel and oracular messages of Isaiah must itself have represented a conscious religious act on the part of Ahaz, deliberately abandoning faith in the traditions of the election of David and Zion, especially the associated promises of holy war deliverance. This may be attributed not only to the extraordinary situation of crisis and the possible decadence of traditional Yahwism at this time, but also to the radical interpretation given to these traditions by Isaiah when he placed trust in Yahweh in exclusive opposition to trust in military defenses and political alliances.[1]

---

[1] Although the final words *ʾēt* *melek* *ʾaššûr* are generally recognized to be a gloss, they probably represent an accurate interpretation of the implication of the verse.

[2] On *t^{ec}ûdâ* and *tôrâ* in 8:16 as referring specifically to Isaiah's oracles directed to the king on the basis of the dynastic covenant traditions see Vischer, *Die* *Immanuel-Botschaft*, pp. 34-36.

---

[1] The degree to which Isaiah advocated abandonment of armed defenses or the degree to which he calculated practical political and military probabilities cannot be answered with finality. In any case one cannot identify his views either with sheer political isolationism or with modern pacifist theories of nonresistance or nonviolent resistance which are calculated primarily to convert the enemy. Rather he is trying to show what it means for the king and the nation to trust completely in Yahweh for deliverance in a specific situation of threatened military and political disaster. His tendency to regard reliance on military power and foreign alliances as idolatrous turning away from Yahweh represents a theme already apparent in Amos and Hosea and may be related to the tendency of popular holy war stories composed after the time of David and Solomon to stress the totally miraculous character of such deliverances with Israel's participation limited to prayerful trust. On this tendency see the chapter entitled "Der heilige Krieg in der nachsalomonischen Novellistik" in von Rad, Heilige Krieg, pp. 33-50. For a survey of literature on the political role of the prophets see H. J. Kraus, Prophetie und Politik (Theologische Existenz Heute, Neue Folge, 36; München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1952), pp. 5-16.

D. Hezekiah's Reform and Isaiah's Renewal of the Demand for Trust, Isaiah 14:28-32

Hezekiah's accession in 715 or 714 seems to have signaled the beginning of a new phase in the career of Isaiah.[1] Hezekiah's cultic reform was a reversal of the policies of Ahaz and may therefore have included some kind of reconciliation with Isaiah enabling him to resume his former cultic function and his role as an advisor to the king. The legend-like narratives in II Kings 18:17-20:19 = Isaiah 36-39 show Hezekiah resorting to Isaiah for divine intercession and guidance. Hezekiah's attentiveness to radically Yahwistic prophetic oracles and threats concerning Zion is independently confirmed by the recollection in Jeremiah 26:18-19 of Micah's pronouncement of doom on Zion and Hezekiah's penitent response (cf. Mic. 3:12).[2]

The precise date, character and extent of Hezekiah's cultic reforms cannot be determined from the summary statement in II Kings 18:4 beyond the note concerning the destruction of the bronze serpent Nehushtan. However, the basic historicity of a significant cultic reform by Hezekiah is now generally accepted and regarded as a corollary of his policy of repudiating Assyrian suzerainty.[1] The removal of the bronze serpent indicates that it went beyond merely reversing what Ahaz had done. This may be confirmed by the reported speech of the Rabshakeh demanding the surrender of Jerusalem which refers to Hezekiah removing Yahwistic high places and altars and ordering Judah and Jerusalem to worship at the altar in Jerusalem (II Kgs. 18:22 = Is. 36:7 = II Chr. 32:12).[2]

---

[1] For useful summaries of the stages in Isaiah's career see Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 161-162, C. R. North, "Isaiah," IDB, II, 732-733, and Fohrer, Jesaja, I, 2-12. The date of 715/714 may be accepted for Hezekiah's accession on the basis of II Kgs. 18:13 regardless of how one explains the seeming discrepancy in 18:1. On this complex question see Gray, Kings, pp. 73-74, 572, 607-608, and S. J. De Vries, "Chronology of the Old Testament," IDB, I, 593-595.

[2] On this passage note the comment of J. Paterson, "Jeremiah," PCB, §481b, who regards Micah's oracle as the primary occasion of the reform.

The extensive account of the reform in II Chronicles 29-31 is also accorded some degree of historicity by several recent scholars, especially the report that Hezekiah tried to include representatives from the former Northern Kingdom as participants in the reformed Jerusalem cult, making the Davidic king and Zion by implication the symbols of a reunified Israel (30:1-12,18).[3] For the Chronicler the reform and Passover celebration led immediately to the great holy war deliverance from Sennacherib in which Hezekiah's faith and the prayer of Isaiah are of central importance (II Chr. 32:1-23, note especially the transitional vs. 1).

---

[1] See for example the standard histories, Robinson in W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, _A History of Israel, I: From the Exodus to the Fall of Jerusalem, 586 B.C._ (London: Oxford University Press, 1932), 392-393, Noth, _History_, pp. 265-266, and Bright, _History_, pp. 261-263, 265-267; so also Ringgren, _Israelite Religion_, p. 165. In contrast to Snaith, "Kings," p. 289, who regards II Kgs. 18:4 as originating with the Deuteronomic compiler or a postexilic editor, Montgomery, _Kings_, pp. 480-481, and Gray, _Kings_, p. 608, both regard the verse as an excerpt from an annalistic source.

[2] This story probably derives from a different though not necessarily earlier source than the statement in 18:4. It is often suggested that this passage may reflect the situation of Josiah's reform in implying exclusive centralization of the cult at Jerusalem, so Fohrer, _Jesaja_, II, 162. Gray, _Kings_, p. 601, connects it with a narrative source composed at that time, but nevertheless regards it as an authentic historical recollection of Hezekiah's reform, p. 619; similarly Snaith, "Kings," pp. 294-295. Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 156-363, regards this as part of an almost contemporary source and treats the reference as fully reliable.

[3] So Bright, _History_, p. 266, H. B. MacLean, "Hezekiah," _IDB_, II, 598-599, and Wright, "Deuteronomy," p. 323; cf. G. E. Wright and F. V. Filson, _The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible_ (rev. ed., Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956), p. 73, who suggest that Hezekiah tried to gain control of Samaria and Galilee within the framework of Assyrian suzerainty.

The actual course of events was of course more complex than this and cannot be reconstructed with certainty. But Isaiah's attitude and counsel during the early part of Hezekiah's reign is fairly well attested. He strongly opposed moves to escape from Assyrian suzerainty which occurred in connection with the Ashdod rebellion suppressed by Sargon in 711.[1] Isaiah 14:28-32, an oracle dated in the year of Ahaz's death and therefore coinciding with the beginning of Hezekiah's reign, warns the Philistines against revolt and indicates that instead of joining in revolt Judah must look for security to Yahweh who founded Zion.[2] Isaiah's concluding message in verse 32b, *kî yhwh yissad ṣiyyôn* / *ûbô yeḥ^{e}sû* *^{ca}niyyê* *^{c}ammî*, looks like another embryonic saying of the same type as 7:9b, 28:16c, and 30:15.[3] This word of assurance has no inner or indissoluble connection with the preceding context and may well be a citation of a saying formulated on some prior occasion. As a formula-like capsule summary of his message it depicts Zion as the symbol of Yahweh's holy war protection of his people, drawing upon traditional language referring to the election of Zion, the building of the temple, and cultic asylum.

---

[1] Is. 18:1-6; 20:1-6; and perhaps 19:1-15; 22:1-14;15-23. On these passages and their historical setting see Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 161-162, 275-280, 284-285, 289-294, Bright, *History*, pp. 264-265, 275-276, Fohrer, *Jesaja*, I, 9-10, and Noth, *History*, pp. 264-265.

[2] On this dating of the passage see Bright, "Isaiah--I," §433b, G. E. Wright, *The Book of Isaiah* (LBC, 11; Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964), p. 56, and Fohrer, *Jesaja*, I, 9, 201-202. On the complicated historical and exegetical difficulties of the passage see the remarks of Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 265-266, and the various views cited by Procksch, *Jesaia I*, pp. 202-206, and Gray, *Isaiah*, I, 265-267.

[3] The introductory formula, vs. 32a, is obscure and probably corrupt and incomplete though it cannot be restored with confidence. From the context it probably refers to Philistine agents who are attempting to draw Judah into revolt. See Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 266, Donner, *Israel unter den Völkern*, p. 111, and Procksch, *Jesaia I*, pp. 202-206. In vs. 32b the word *ûbāh* of MT seems to make Zion itself function as a fortress or place of asylum. But the reading *wbw* of IQIs^{a}, probably supported by LXX *di' autou*, may be tentatively accepted. Note especially LXX mss. S

The first half-line of Isaiah 14:32b, *yhwh yissad ṣiyyôn*, calls to mind Psalm 78:68-69, which climaxes a poetic recital of the transferral of the ark from Shiloh to Jerusalem by portraying Yahweh's election of Mt. Zion and building of the sanctuary in terms of the cosmological analogy of his founding of the earth (*y^{e}sādāh*).[1] It likewise calls to mind the oracular words of Isaiah 28:16:

> *hin^{e}nî m^{e}yassed b^{e}ṣiyyôn ʼeben*
> *ʼeben bôḥan* / *pinnat yiqrat* / *mûsād m^{e}yussād*
> *hammaʼ^{a}mîn lōʼ yāḥîš*[2]

---

and L, *tēn siōn*, feminine, ruling it out as the antecedent of *diʼ autou*. This reading, accepted by Donner, pp. 110-111, indicates that Zion functions above all as the symbol of Yahweh's protection.

[1] See above, chap. 5, §A.

[2] The ungrammatical piel perfect *yissad* of MT must be emended to qal or piel participle as the normal idiom following *hin^{e}nî*; cf. IQIs^{a}, *mysd*, and the readings of the LXX, Syriac and Targum cited by *BH* as presupposing a participle construction. Note also the discussion in Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 170. No further emendation of the passage is necessary if one takes *ʼeben bôḥan*, *pinnat yiqrat*, and *mûsād m^{e}yussād* as a series of three honorific designations of the stone established in Zion; cf. the series of four two-member honorific titles for the Davidic king in Is. 9:6 and the six two- and three-member laudatory titles for Zion as the City of God in Ps. 48:2c-3. The peculiar pointing of the second *mwsd* must be a mixed pual and hophal participle form; cf. Procksch, *Jesaia I*, p. 357. For similar constructions with pual participle see Ps. 64:7 and Prov. 30:24. The retention of feminine *t* in *pinnat yiqrat* absolute can be explained as an archaism or as the use of a construct form when followed by another expression in apposition, *GK*, §130e.

The embryonic oracle *hamma'^{a}mîn lô' yāḥîš* in this passage is apparently intended as an inscription on the stone or as the climactic designation of the very stone itself.[1] Aside from this, the symbolism of Yahweh establishing a foundation stone in Zion is notably obscure.[2] But the language most nearly resembles that used in describing the preparation and laying of large and costly hewn stones as the foundation of Solomon's temple (I Kgs. 5:31; 7:10). It also has verbal contacts with the cosmological language of Psalm 104:5, and especially Job 8:4-6 which refers to Yahweh's founding the earth and includes the imagery of laying a cornerstone. Thus in both Isaiah 14:32 and 28:16 the traditional imagery of Yahweh choosing or founding Zion, together with its possible cosmological overtones, is used to represent Zion as the symbol of unconditional trust in Yahweh over against false trust in political alliances.

In the second half line of Isaiah 14:32b, *ûbô yeḥ^{e}sû ^{ca}niyyê ^{c}ammî*, this symbolism is enhanced by the imagery of cultic asylum implied in the verb *ḥsh*.[3] The early assimilation of cultic asylum imagery into the holy war and storm theophany language of the Jerusalem cultic tradition is apparent in the occurrence of *ḥsh* in Psalm 18:3,31, in the context of a royal psalm of thanksgiving for victory in battle picturing Yahweh's victory in terms of a theophany intervention.[1]

---

[1] See Fohrer, *Jesaja*, II, 59. On the meaning of the embryonic oracle see above, §B.

[2] Some common suggestions are: that the stone symbolizes the remnant perhaps as Isaiah's own circle of disciples, Lindblom, *Prophecy*, pp. 342-343, 356, and Donner, *Israel unter den Völkern*, pp. 152-153; or the expected messianic king of Is. 7:14-17; 9:1-6; 11:1-9; 16:5, Procksch, *Jesaia I*, p. 358; or the foundation stone or underlying sacred rock of the temple which, according to later Jewish legend, God created to block the underground chaos waters, Ringgren, *Israelite Religion*, pp. 162-163. However, the passage itself and its context give little basis for either confirming or refuting any of these suppositions.

[3] The expression *ḥsh b...* with Yahweh or some substitute expression as object occurs often in individual laments and related types of psalms, referring in all probability to the seeking of cultic asylum at Zion. For the clearest examples see Pss. 7:2; 11:1; 16:1; 17:7; 36:8; 57:2;

Thus, in the allusive words of the embryonic saying concerning Zion in Isaiah 14:32b, Isaiah focuses into a sharp point the rich and complex heritage of cultic language and symbolism associated with Zion. Zion is the symbol of a national existence totally reliant upon Yahweh for security. Apart from such reliance the nation has no security at all.[2] This is expressed forcefully in the phrase *^{ca}niyyê* *^{c}ammî* referring to Judah as a nation. The word *^{c}ānî*, like *ḥsh*, is closely related to the language of cultic asylum and refers to one who, in a legally helpless or defenseless state, flees to Zion to appeal for Yahweh's intervention against his enemy.[3]

E. Oracles on Yahweh's Defense of Zion in the Stories of Sennacherib's Invasion

Several of Isaiah's most important oracles concerning Zion derive

---

61:5; 71:1; 91:4 as discussed in Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 56, 89, 120, 130, 132, 282-283, 412-413, 433, 490, and II, 636-637; cf. von Rad, *Theology*, I, 402-403, and H. J. Hermisson, *Sprache und Ritus im altisraelitischen Kult* (WMANT, 19; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965), pp. 113-118.

[1] On the cultic asylum imagery in Ps. 18 see Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 142, 148. On the holy war and theophany elements in this psalm see chap. 5, §D.

[2] Similarly B. S. Childs, *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis* (SBT, Second Series 3; Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1967), pp. 59-61.

[3] See Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 82-83, and von Rad, *Theology*, I, 400-401. Although relatively late, Ps. 9-10 probably preserves older traditional language when it connects the imagery of Yahweh enthroned at Zion with

from the second part of Hezekiah's reign when Judah was attempting to escape from the domination of Sennacherib who came to the Assyrian throne in 705.[1] The historical and literary problems connected with the narratives concerning these happenings in II Kings 18:13-19:37 (= Is. 36-37; cf. II Chr. 32:1-23) are of such complexity that they cannot be discussed in depth here. By general agreement II Kings 18:13-16, only the first verse of which is retained in Isaiah 36:1, is a distinct literary unit preserving or depending upon a Judean annalistic account of Hezekiah's submission to Sennacherib in 701.[2] II Kings 18:17-19:37 is usually analyzed into two separate stories joined editorially at 19:8 or 9, with the conclusion to the second story being the report of the plague striking the Assyrian army in 19:35, and the conclusion of the first story the report in 19:36-37 of Sennacherib's return to Assyria and his violent death.[3] Both stories agree that Hezekiah faced the crisis with a complete

---

his concern for the *^{ca}niyyîm*, 9:12-13; cf. 14:6; 34:7. The use of the word *^{c}ānî* in Pss. 18:28 and 68:11 referring to Israel confirms the antiquity of this image in depicting Israel's dependence on Yahweh; cf. Kraus, pp. 147, 473.

[1] On political events associated with the death of Sargon and the early years of Sennacherib's reign see A. Scharff and A. Moortgat, *Ägypten und Vorderasien im Altertum* (München: Verlag F. Bruckmann, 1950), pp. 414-416, Bright, *History*, pp. 267-269, Noth, *History*, pp. 265-268, Robinson in Oesterley and Robinson, *History*, I, 387-389, and A. L. Oppenheim, "Sennacherib," *IDB*, IV, 270-271. On the success of the Babylonians in involving Judah in revolt see II Kgs. 20:12-15 = Is. 39:1-4.

[2] Cf. Montgomery, *Kings*, pp. 482-485, Gray, *Kings*, pp. 610-612, and Childs, *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis*, pp. 69-73. The same event is recorded in much greater detail in Sennacherib's annals of his third campaign against Phoenicia and Palestine, *ANET*, pp. 287-288.

[3] Montgomery, *Kings*, p. 515, Snaith, "Kings," pp. 292, 304, Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 239, Fohrer, *Jesaja*, II, 179-180, and Childs, *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis*, pp. 69-103, all divide the passage into two sources, 18:17-19:9a,36-37 and 19:9b-35. Differing slightly, Gray,

and undivided act of trust of the kind often demanded by Isaiah. There may be reason to doubt the authenticity of this portrayal since it would mean a radical reversal of his earlier policy of joining alliances of resistance to Assyria. Isaiah had strongly opposed Hezekiah's original revolt against Sennacherib and the various international intrigues accompanying it as indicated by many oracles.[1] In contrast to this the stories in II Kings 18:17-19:37 portray an idealized holy war in which the king places his entire trust in Yahweh whose theophany presence is symbolized by the ark and cherubim in Zion.[2] Yahweh responds with an oracle of deliverance and then a holy war victory totally independent of any human act of military defense. As such, the stories probably portray in popularized form Isaiah's holy war faith centering in Zion and the Davidic king, and Hezekiah's ideal piety.[3] But it is possible that

---

Kings, pp. 601-606, 622, 631, places the break after 19:7, regarding vs. 8 as the editorial bridge between the two stories. Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 156-157, regards 18:17-19:4c plus the oracle in 19:20-28 as deriving from an almost contemporary "prophetic biography" whereas 19:4d-19,29-37 preserves in badly disarranged form an account from a later and less historical source. E. J. Kissane, The Book of Isaiah (Dublin: The Richview Press, 1941), I, 397-398, 409, attempts to maintain the unity of the entire passage.

[1] For example Is. 1:4-9; 28:7-13,14-22; 29:15-16; 30:1-7,12-17; 31:1-3; and perhaps 22:1-14,15,23. On the delimitation of these passages and their connection with the revolt against Sennacherib in 705-701 see Bright, History, p. 276, and "Isaiah--I," Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 162. Fohrer, Jesaja, I, 9-11, differs in placing 28:7-13,14-22; 30:12-17 before 711.

[2] On the theological implications of these stories note the discussion by Schreiner, Sion-Jerusalem, pp. 271-278.

[3] The recent form-critical analysis of these stories by Childs, Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis, pp. 73-103, stresses their legendary motifs and doubtful historical value. In order to maintain their historicity a number of authors have connected them with a hypothetical second

Hezekiah in a situation of extreme crisis did throw himself on the mercy of Yahweh and seek oracular assurance of deliverance when all other means of escape failed. That Isaiah finally pronounced doom upon the Assyrians and proclaimed the deliverance of Zion is confirmed by oracles in other contexts.[1] There is therefore no a priori reason for rejecting the basic authenticity of the oracles of deliverance preserved in II Kings 19:21-34 (= Is. 37:22-35) in the context of the second story of deliverance, despite some evidence of secondary reshaping and adaptation.[2]

---

campaign of Sennacherib in Palestine between 690 and 686 after the 25th dynasty Ethiopian pharaoh Tirhakah (I Kgs. 19:9) came to power in Egypt. In support of this see Bright, *History*, pp. 269-271, 282-287, Gray, *Kings*, pp. 602-605, 616, 623-624, W. F. Albright, "The Biblical Period," *The Jews: Their History, Culture and Religion*, ed. L. Finkelstein (New York: Harper & Bros., 1949, as reprinted separately, Pittsburgh, 1955), pp. 43-44, Wright, *Isaiah*, pp. 19-20, 77-78, MacLean, "Hezekiah," p. 600, Bright, "Isaiah--I," §446a-c. For an earlier tentative statement of the two-campaign theory see Gray, *Isaiah*, I, lxxix-lxxx. In support of the more traditional one-campaign view connecting these stories with the invasion of 701 see Robinson in Oesterley and Robinson, *History*, I, 395-401, 409-410, Kissane, *Isaiah*, I, 397-398, Montgomery, *Kings*, pp. 516-517, and Fohrer, *Jesaja*, II, 152-153.

[1] See especially Is. 10:5-15; 10:24-27c; 14:24-27; 17:12-14; 29:5-8; 30:27-33; 31:4-9. On the delimitation and setting of these passages see Bright, *History*, p. 276, and "Isaiah--I," Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 162. Fohrer, *Jesaja*, I, 9-11, 18-19, dates 29:1-8 to 711 and regards 10:24-27c; 17:12-14 as unauthentic.

[2] These oracles are closely coordinated with the narrative context. But Procksch, *Jesaia I*, pp. 452, 454, points out that the story has more likely been shaped to fit the oracles than vice versa. Fohrer, *Jesaja*, II, 175-178, treats them as late compositions based on traditional sayings from various Isaianic and post-Isaianic sources. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 275-276, regards them as "eine Zusammenstellung verschiedener bearbeiteter Isaiasworte." Gray, *Kings*, p. 625, labels them as coming "from the Isaianic circle, but on the periphery of the authentic Isaianic tradition," but treats them as reliable evidence of Isaiah's words. Actually, the only plausible evidences of later reshaping are the possible reference to the Assyrian conquest of Egypt in vs. 24, the language reminiscent of Deutero-Isaiah in vs. 25, and the Deuteronomic style reference to David in vs. 34. Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 156-157, 365,

The first of these three oracles, II Kings 19:21-28 (= Is. 37:22-29), resembles in thought the oracle in Isaiah 10:5-15. In both cases the arrogance with which the Assyrians view their own conquests constitutes mockery of Yahweh and prompts Yahweh to plan retribution against them. In both cases this arrogance reaches its climax and becomes insufferable at the point when it is directed against Jerusalem.[1] It is not that Zion is inherently inviolable or that Yahweh will automatically protect Zion. Yahweh has purposely used Assyria to punish Jerusalem. But the Assyrians have gone beyond their appointed role and have made their attack on Jerusalem a symbol of scorn and mockery against Yahweh. Both Isaiah 10:5-15 and the oracle in II Kings 19:21-28 support the implication of the narratives in II Kings 18:17-19:37 that this arrogant mockery of Yahweh was what prompted Isaiah to proclaim the deliverance of

---

368-370, who seems to accept the basic authenticity of the oracles, points out that the oracle attributed to Isaiah in II Kgs. 19:6-7 may be a prose summary of the more original poetic oracle preserved in 19:32-34.

[1] In Is. 10:5-15 the allusions to Jerusalem in vss. 10-12 are often regarded either as unauthentic or as inserted fragments of originally distinct oracles; cf. Gray, Isaiah, I, 194-198. Verse 12 is obviously a disruptive prose comment. Furthermore vs. 10 is incongruent with vs. 11 in seeming to represent the Assyrian conquest of Samaria as still impending rather than as already accomplished. The most common solution is to regard vs. 10 as well as 12 as intrusive, so Procksch, Jesaia I, pp. 166-167, Kaiser, Jesaja 1-12, pp. 112-113, and Fohrer, Jesaja, I, pp. 153, 156. Alternatively an extensive emendation of vs. 10 proposed by Kissane, Isaiah, I, 124, 127-128, is favored by Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 241, and Bright, "Isaiah-I," §430h. The problem in vs. 10 probably arose from such deep-seated textual confusion that no conjectural reconstruction can be accepted with confidence, but not necessarily from intrusive material. The attempt of Eichrodt, Der Heilige in Israel, pp. 122-129, to separate out vss. 8-12,16a,18bc as an entirely distinct poem is too subjective to be acceptable. Whatever its origin, vs. 12 may be taken as an accurate prose summation of the basic thought of the oracle.

Zion and the defeat of Assyria as a holy war victory of Yahweh. The same thought probably lies behind the threat oracle in Isaiah 14:24-27, perhaps connected originally with the oracles of Isaiah 10. Here the divine destruction of Assyria *b^{e}'arṣî w^{e}^{c}al-hāray* is an inescapable part of Yahweh's sovereign and universal plan for the world.[1] In all of these oracles Zion does not participate actively in her own defense. Instead, according to the imagery of II Kings 19:21, she is personified as a defenseless maiden, *b^{e}tûlat bat-ṣiyyôn, bat y^{e}rûšālēm*, who mocks derisively, almost as a bystander, when Sennacherib is unexpectedly turned back to his homeland by Yahweh.

The oracle in II Kings 19:32-34 (= Is. 37:33-35) contains the most clear and concise promise given anywhere of Yahweh's holy war defense of Jerusalem.[2] In essence this oracle simply asserts that Sennacherib will depart without besieging the city. This implies that Yahweh will turn him back contrary to his own intentions, as asserted explicitly in the similar concluding lines of the first oracle of the group, II Kings 19:21-28. In fact, the words *badderek* *'^{a}šer-bā'* *bāh* *yāšub* in 19:33a (reading *bā'* with Is. 37:34a) and *wah^{a}šîbôtîkā* *badderek* *'^{a}šer-bā'tā* *bāh* in 19:28c appear to be variants of the same saying. The words *w^{e}šāb* *l^{e}'arṣô* in 19:7 (*w^{e}šāb* *'el-'arṣô* in Is. 37:7) echo it more vaguely. The paronomasia evident in the adjacent words *bā'* and *bāh* together with the vivid and balanced yet slightly enigmatic antithesis between *bā'* and *yāšûb* indicate that this may be another embryonic oracle.[1] This saying comes at the climax of each oracle, summing up its essential message. It may in reality have been the starting point for the composition of both. The corresponding oracle in II Kings 19:6-7 (= Is. 37:6-7), which Scott regards as a secondary prose reformulation of 19:32-34, may be taken as an early and perhaps reliable interpretation of these oracles in the Isaianic school. In 19:7 (= Is. 37:7) the words *hin^{e}nî* *nōtēn* *bô* *rûaḥ* perhaps imply a divine panic or terror of the kind traditionally associated with Yahweh's holy war intervention, though the following words may imply that a report of trouble at home would prompt him to return.[2] This form of the oracle is also introduced by the traditional holy war formula of assurance *'al-tîrā'* (19:6; cf. Is. 7:4; 10:24).

---

[1] Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 263-269, also includes 10:27d-34 in this category with its vivid description of the enemy marching toward Jerusalem and shaking his fist at *har bt-ṣiyyôn* / *gib^{c}at y^{e}rûšālēm*, only to be destroyed by a sudden divine intervention depicted under the imagery of the felling of a lofty tree. But it is not certain that the juxtaposition of vss. 27d-32 and 33-34 is original. Furthermore, the itinerary of the approaching army is from the north and therefore more likely refers to the Syro-Ephraimitic invasion in 734 than to the invasions of Sargon and Sennacherib launched against Jerusalem from Philistia to the west; cf. Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 246.

[2] The oracle formula *n^{e}'um-yhwh* (lacking in the Syriac; cf. *BH*) at the end of vs. 33 is probably evidence that vs. 34 is a separate oracle fragment; cf. Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 370, and Gray, *Kings*, p. 630, though as pointed out by Procksch, *Jesaia I*, pp. 458-459, vss. 33,34 can be taken as a poetic couplet if the formula *n^{e}'um-yhwh* is deleted with the Syriac or shifted to the end of vs. 34 and *ûl^{e}ma^{c}an dāwid ^{c}abdî* omitted as a Deuteronomic addition (cf. I Kgs. 11:13,34; 15:4; II Kgs. 8:19).

---

[1] Scott, "Isaiah's Oracles," pp. 185-186, does not notice this example.

[2] Cf. von Rad, *Heilige Krieg*, pp. 12-13, and the remarks of Procksch, *Jesaia I*, pp. 447-448. Saul's madness is explained in I Sam. 19:18-24 (cf. 16:15-16,23; 18:10; 19:9) as an effect of the *rûaḥ* *'^{e}lōhîm* which seizes him and prevents him from apprehending David at Naioth. Somewhat differently in I Kgs. 22:20-23 an evil spirit from Yahweh deceives Ahab's prophets and thereby brings about his defeat and death in battle. Also note *rûaḥ* *^{c}iw^{c}îm*, Is. 19:14, and *rûaḥ* *tardēmâ*, Is. 29:10.

In the oracle fragment or supplement in II Kings 19:34 (= Is. 37:35) the words *w^{e}gannôtî* *^{c}al-hā^{c}îr* *hazzô’t* / *l^{e}hôšî^{c}āh* *l^{e}ma^{ca}nî*[1] present a different holy war image of Yahweh as a warrior defending Jerusalem. A variant of this saying is preserved in an oracle fragment in II Kings 20:6b which is probably represented in a more original form in the Isaiah 38:6 parallel. Obviously out of context in the story of Hezekiah's illness, this fragment can probably be reconstructed textually as a balanced poetic line, *ûmikkap* *melek-’aššûr* *’aṣṣîl^{e}kā* / *w^{e}gannôtî* *^{c}al-hā^{c}îr* *hazzō’t*.[2] What appears to be still another variant of this same saying occurs in Isaiah 31:5:

k^{e}ṣipp^{o}rîm *^{c}āpôt* / *kēn* *yāgēn* ... *^{c}al-y^{e}rûšālēm*
gānôn *w^{e}hiṣṣîl* / *pāsôaḥ* *w^{e}himlîṭ*[3]

This indicates that the rare verb *gnn* or the juxtaposition of *gnn* and *hiṣṣîl* may have functioned in some way as an embryonic oracle for Isaiah. The imagery implied in *gnn* is probably that of Yahweh as a warrior carrying or acting as a shield, *māgēn*.[4] The noun *māgēn* occurs as a title for Yahweh in the context of traditional hymnic theophany and holy war imagery in Deuteronomy 33:29 and Psalm 18:3,31,36 (cf. Ps. 144:2), and in the closely related imagery of cultic asylum as seen in Psalms 3:4; 7:11; 28:7 (cf. Pss. 33:20 and 59:12).[1] Isaiah combines holy war and cultic asylum imagery in 14:32b to depict Zion as the symbol of security through reliance on Yahweh. It is equally plausible to assume that when he uses the verb gnn he is evoking the traditional theophany, holy war and cultic asylum connotations of māgēn as a divine title. The holy war and theophany connotations of the verb gnn are confirmed contextually in two late postexilic passages, Zechariah 9:15 and 12:8, which depict eschatologically Yahweh's protection of Jerusalem.

---

[1] Reading *^{c}al* with Is. 37:35 instead of *’el*, and omitting *ûl^{e}ma^{c}an* *dawid* *^{c}abdî* as a Deuteronomic addition.

[2] This reconstruction is obtained from the Is. 38:6 form of the text by eliminating the repetitious words *w^{e}’et* *hā^{c}îr* *hazzō’t*. II Kgs. 20:6b (= Is. 38:6) is often regarded as nothing more than a secondary literary expansion or editorial link based on 19:34 (= Is. 37:35), so Montgomery, *Kings*, p. 507, Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 372, and Fohrer, *Jesaja*, II, 184. More likely it reflects a genuine variant as recognized by Gray, *Kings*, p. 634.

[3] The words *yhwh* *ṣ^{e}bā’ôt* disrupt the meter and may be omitted as a repetitious intrusion from the preceding line; cf. LXX mss. A, Q and some fragments which lack *ṣ^{e}bā’ôt*. The form *yāgēn* may best be taken with *GB*, *KB*, as qal rather than hiphil.

[4] The verb *gnn* can be interpreted either in the sense of "shield" on

F. Yahweh's Theophany Defense of Zion, Isaiah 31:4-5,8-9; 30:27-33; and 10:24-27c

Several important oracles of Isaiah proclaim Yahweh's holy war defense of Zion against the Assyrians in awesome, yet mysteriously vague, theophany-like terms. These include especially Isaiah 10:24-27c; 29:1-8; 30:27-33; and 31:4-9 which must be examined with some care.

Isaiah 31:4-5,8-9 preserves one of Isaiah's most important oracles.[2] The verb yērēd in verse 4e, a frequently occurring theophany term,

---

the basis of the noun māgēn or in the sense of "enclose, fence off" on the basis of the noun gan according to KB. But the semantic correlation with māgēn presupposed by Schreiner, Sion-Jerusalem, p. 247, seems more likely both because it is a military term and because the meaning "fenced off enclosure" of the word gan has receded into the background in most of its occurrences.

[1] See Schreiner, Sion-Jerusalem, p. 247.

[2] Verses 6-7 are an obviously disruptive prose insertion as noted by most interpreters; cf. Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 340.

indicates a theophany appearance by Yahweh on Mt. Zion reminiscent of the Sinai theophany and the holy war theophany tradition associated with the ark and cherubim.[1]

kēn *yērēd* *yhwh* *ṣ^{e}bā'ôt* / *liṣbô'* *^{c}al-har-ṣiyyôn* *w^{e}^{c}al-gib^{c}ātāh*

The title *yhwh* *ṣ^{e}bā'ôt*, likewise associated with the ark and its holy war symbolism, is used frequently by Isaiah and is associated with the imagery of Yahweh's kingship in Isaiah 6:3,5 in the context of Isaiah's theophany vision in the temple. The expression *liṣbô'* *^{c}al* must first be interpreted in the sense of "fight against" in accordance with the regular idiom elsewhere, thus presenting a bitter pun on *ṣ^{e}bā'ôt* by depicting Yahweh's holy war power as directed against Zion.[2] This is confirmed by the imagery in the preceding lines of a lion with its prey (vs. 31a-d), an image used also in Isaiah 5:29 to depict the inescapable ferocity of Assyria's divinely directed attack on Israel, and in similar threatening ways in Amos 3:8,12 and Hosea 5:14; 13:8.[1] Thus 31:4 must have been composed originally as a threat against Zion, but subsequently expanded and converted by Isaiah into a promise of deliverance in a way analogous to 29:1-8 to be discussed below.

---

[1] Cf. Jeremias, *Theophanie*, p. 61. *BDB* lists 22 occurrences of *yrd* qal as a theophany term. It occurs four times in the great Sinai theophany complex, Ex. 19:11,18,20; 34:5; cf. 3:8 and Neh. 9:13. It depicts Yahweh's theophany appearances to Moses at the tent of meeting, Ex. 33:9; Num. 11:17,25; 12:5. It occurs in the context of the holy war and hymnic theophany passage in Ps. 18:10 = II Sam. 22:10 (cf. Ps. 144:5) where Yahweh is depicted in storm theophany terms, riding on a cherub; cf. above chap. 1, §E, chap. 5, §D. It likewise occurs in Mic. 1:3 in a judgment theophany perhaps associated with the temple; cf. Is. 63:19 and 64:2.

[2] On *ṣābā'* *^{c}al* as meaning "fight against, attack," see Num. 31:7; Is. 29:7,8; Zech. 14:12, and Procksch, *Jesaia* *I*, pp. 406-407. Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 340, argues that *lisbô'* should be deleted as an accidental textual variant of *ṣ^{e}bā'ôt*. This would improve the poetic balance since the second half of the line seems excessively long. However Isaiah's love of word plays plus his use of the same expression in 29:7,8 argues for the authenticity of the text. If the line is to be emended at all, *^{c}al-gib^{c}ātāh* at the end rather than *liṣbô'* should be deleted as a superfluous addition following Fohrer, *Jesaja*, II, 114.

This indicates that for Isaiah Yahweh's wrath against Zion was temporary in character and would, at the appropriate time, be redirected against Assyria as in 10:25. The construction of verse 5 is patterned after that of verse 4 except that it is shorter.[2] The expression *yāgēn* ... *ᶜal-yᵉrûšālēm* in verse 5 expresses the idea of protection in an unambiguous and emphatic way. It thereby has the surprising effect of transforming the lion imagery, the theophany picture, and the idiom *lişbô’ ᶜal* of verse 4 into a picture of Yahweh defending rather than attacking Zion.[3] The analogous structure of verses 4 and 5 makes it necessary to interpret *kᵉşippᵉrîm ᶜāpôt* as an image of Yahweh protectively hovering over Zion like birds protecting a nest.[4]

Just as *yērēd* in verse 4 evokes the Sinai theophany tradition and the theophany and holy war traditions associated with the ark and cherubim, so *pasôaḥ* in verse 5 evokes the Passover and exodus deliverance tradition.[1] Verses 8-9a stress the miraculous nature of the defeat and destruction of the Assyrians, which will be accomplished by Yahweh without human participation and will be so complete that those left will be defenseless.[2] The hymnlike line, *’^{a}šer-’ûr lô b^{e}siyyôn* / *w^{e}tannûr lô bîrûšālēm*, attached to the word Yahweh in the closing oracle formula, verse 9b, may once again allude to the Sinai theophany tradition as transposed to Zion and symbolized by the altar of burnt offerings.[3] The word *kî* introducing the opening oracle formula in verse 4a may indicate that verses 4-5,8-9 as an oracle of deliverance was linked by Isaiah himself with the preceding reproach, verses 1-3, warning against placing reliance on the military alliance with Egypt.[4]

---

[1] Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 244-245, who rejects the view that 31:4 is threatening in character, nevertheless thinks that Isaiah consciously modelled this saying on the earlier saying preserved in 5:29.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 224. The sequence *k* ... *kēn* in vs. 5 corresponds to *ka’ᵃšer* ... *kēn* in vs. 4 and *yāgēn* ... *ᶜal-yᵉrûšālēm* in vs. 5 to *yērēd* ... *lişbô’* *ᶜal-har-şiyyôn* in vs. 4.

[3] That vs. 4 can bear this alternative meaning without textual emendation may be seen from the discussion in Fohrer, *Jesaja*, II, 116.

[4] Cf. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 246-247. For the contrasting view that the simile refers to the inhabitants of Jerusalem see Fohrer, *Jesaja*, II, 116-117.

Isaiah's use of traditional holy war hymnic theophany language to depict Yahweh's defeat of Assyria is especially evident in Isaiah 30:27-33.[5] This passage, Isaiah's most elaborate theophany description, reflects notably archaic features alongside significant modifications of the traditional theophany pattern. The expression *bā’ mimmerḥāq* (30:27), rather than *yrd* (31:4), is perhaps another vague allusion to the archaic tradition of Yahweh's theophany intervention from Sinai, as in Judges 5:4-5; Deuteronomy 33:2; Habakkuk 3:3; cf. Psalm 68:8-9.[1] It is the *šēm-yhwh* which comes, an expression probably evoking the traditional theophany and holy war symbolism of the ark.[2] The storm theophany imagery in verses 27 and 30, depicting Yahweh's holy war intervention, is akin to that of Psalm 18:8-16 and may likewise reflect archaic and conventional language associated traditionally with the ark as a holy war symbol.[3] The defeat of the Assyrians is also depicted in traditional holy war terms as a divinely induced panic or terror (vs. 31). The passage climaxes with a picture of the Assyrians being burned by Yahweh as a sacrifice, perhaps locating this act in a grimly humorous way at the pagan cult place called *tōpet* (originally *tepet*) in the Hinnom Valley where Ahaz had sacrificed a son, verse 33.[4] But the real point is probably to represent Yahweh himself as carrying out the ancient holy war act of *ḥērem* in such a way as to degrade the Assyrians to the utmost. The antiquity of the theme of a divine act of *ḥērem* in the Jerusalem tradition is shown by its occurrence in Psalm 46:8-10.[1]

---

[1] See Exodus 12:13,23,27, and Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 247-252.

[2] Cf. the comments of Fohrer, *Jesaja*, I, 117-118.

[3] So Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 252-253, who cites Ex. 19:18. The word *tannûr* occurs in the covenant theophany vision of Abraham in Gen. 15:17 which Procksch, *Jesaia I*, p. 409, regards as a reflection of the Sinai covenant theophany tradition; cf. also Ps. 21:10. Isaiah may use it here, however, primarily for paronomasia with *’ûr*.

[4] So Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 61, 135; cf. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 244. In contrast see Procksch, *Jesaia I*, pp. 404, 406.

[5] The seemingly disruptive references to festive activities in vss. 29,32b are best explained as an accidental intrusion of parts of another poem as suggested by Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 336-338, and followed by Bright, "Isaiah--I," §443a.

---

[1] So Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 13, 58, 115-116, 142-143, 154-156, and Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, p. 255.

[2] See the use of *šēm-yhwh* or equivalent expressions in II Sam. 6:2; Pss. 20:2,6,8; 29:2 as discussed above, chap. 1, §F, chap. 4, §F, and chap. 5, §F.

[3] See chap. 5, §D.

[4] The expression *gām-hî’ lammelek* is a gloss intended to explain the obscure word *topteh* which is probably a mere variant of *tōpet*; cf. Symmachus and Theodotion *thapheth* (as cited by *BH*), and Fohrer, *Jesaja*, II, 110. On *tōpet* as a pagan cult place to the god *mōlek* or *melek* where human sacrifice was sometimes carried out see II Kgs. 16:33; 23:10; Jer. 7:31-32; 19:4-6, and the discussions in Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, pp. 162-164, de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 444-446, Gray, *Kings*, p. 669, G. A. Barrois, "Topheth," *IDB*, IV, 673, and above, chap. 6, §B.

In Isaiah 10:24-27c the analogy with the bondage of Israel in Egypt could imply not just one particular attack but a continuing situation of Assyrian oppression. Thus it may be a post-Isaianic prose reformulation of an oracle of Isaiah to keep alive or reawaken hope of impending deliverance from Assyrian domination.[2] But the original situation of the oracle would be the same as that of the other Isaianic oracles announcing the deliverance of Zion and the defeat of Assyria. The promised deliverance of Zion is here introduced with the use of the holy war exhortation to trust, *’al-tîrā’*, as in 7:4. The deliverance is not predicated on any tradition of Zion's inviolability. Instead the oracle draws upon the exodus tradition (cf. Ex. 14:16-18) and the tradition of Gideon's holy war victory over Midian (cf. Jud. 7:24-25 and Ps. 83:9-11), a tradition which Isaiah also uses in one of his royal oracles, Isaiah 9:3.[1] The oracle stresses the temporary character of Yahweh's wrath against Zion and its impending redirection toward Assyria (10:25). This feature also occurs in other oracles of this group. That it became a continuing point of emphasis in the subsequent transmission of Isaiah's oracles against Assyria is evident in the prose gloss in 10:12.

---

[1] See above chap. 6, §D. On the practice of *ḥērem* see de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 260-261, and M. H. Pope, "Devoted," *IDB*, I, 838-839. For similar combinations of motifs stated more explicitly and directed as a threat against Judah and Jerusalem see Jer. 7:31-33; 19:6-8,11b-13. The destruction of invading nations by a divine act of *ḥērem* later became a standard semi-apocalyptic or apocalyptic motif associated with Zion; cf. Is. 34; Mic. 4:11-13; Ezek. 39.

[2] Many commentators reject entirely the authenticity of this oracle. Some label it "eschatological" and date it generally as postexilic or late postexilic, Gray, *Isaiah*, I, 203-205, Fohrer, *Jesaja*, I, 161-162, or even specifically to the Seleucid period, Kaiser, *Jesaja 1-12*, p. 119. Eichrodt, *Der Heilige in Israel*, p. 131, suggests that the oracle is a late seventh century composition dependent upon images derived from Isaiah but with a promise of deliverance more nearly comparable to those of Nahum and Habakkuk. On the other hand Procksch, *Jesaia I*, pp. 172-173, regards these verses as the concluding strophe of 10:5-15 but separated editorially from it. This connection is not very convincing. But there is no adequate reason for completely dissociating the oracle from the Assyrian period or from Isaiah himself. It is best to treat it with Wright, *Isaiah*, p. 48, and Bright, "Isaiah--I," §431b, as an independent pericope dating from late in the career of Isaiah, but to regard it as a prose reformulation with Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 245.

G. The Theophany Tradition and the Deliverance of Ariel, Isaiah 29:1-8

Isaiah 29:1-8 illustrates very clearly Isaiah's method of supplementing threat oracles against Zion to convert them into threats of destruction against a besieging enemy and promises of holy war deliverance for Zion. Verse 1 is a reproach or woe saying introducing a threat in verses 2-4. The oracle is built around a play on the word *’ᵃrî’ēl* (Ariel) in verse 2, which perhaps functioned as an embryonic oracle.[2] The possible meanings of the rare word Ariel must be conjectured partly from the context and partly from other scattered linguistic evidence.[3]

---

[1] On Isaiah's use of the Gideon tradition in 9:1-6 see W. Harrelson, "Nonroyal Motifs in the Royal Eschatology," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, pp. 152-153.

[2] See Scott, "Isaiah's Oracles," p. 186. Verse 2 stands out from the context in that the speaker (Yahweh) refers to Ariel in third person style whereas in vss. 1,3-4 Ariel is addressed in second person style.

[3] For a summary of this evidence see Bright, "Isaiah--I," §441c.

The words *wᵉhāyᵉtâ lî ka’ᵃrî’ēl* may imply a threat that Yahweh will make the city of David into a giant altar hearth of destruction, an image partly analogous to that of 30:33 discussed above.[1] But this meaning is not developed in the context. On the other hand the meaning "underworld ghost, shade" indicated by the Accadian word *arallu* is developed elaborately and explicitly in verse 4. As a name for "the city where David encamped" (vs. 1), Ariel is often connected linguistically with *urusalim*, the Accadian form of the name Jerusalem, the element *’ᵃrî* corresponding to *uru* and *’ēl* being a substitute for the divine name *salim* or *šālēm*.[2] But the nonoccurrence of the word elsewhere referring to Jerusalem indicates that Ariel was probably not in itself a significant or well known name for Jerusalem. The supposed linguistic connections with the name

---

[1] This interpretation, adopted by many commentators such as Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 323, Fohrer, *Jesaja*, II, 70-71, is based on Ezek. 43:15-16 and the Moabite inscription, *KAI*, 121:12 (*’r’l*). The textual variations in Ezek. 43:15-16 between *har’ēl* and *’ar’ēl* (kethib) or *’ᵃrî’ēl* (qere) support the widely accepted view that "altar" or "altar hearth" is a secondary meaning based on the temple tower and cosmic world mountain symbolism of the altar. On this view the word *’ᵃrî’ēl* (originally *’ar’ēl*) derives from Accadian *arallu* meaning both "cosmic world mountain, mountain of the gods," and "underworld," which was sometimes Hebraized as *har’ēl*, "mountain of God." On this point see Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, p. 151, and de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 412-413. For a different derivation see C. R. North, "Ariel," *IDB*, I, 218, who makes "altar hearth" the original meaning based on the root *’ry* "burn" plus afformative *l*.

[2] See above, chap. 3, §A. One might even conjecture on the basis of the apparent spelling *’rw’l* in IQIsᵃ that the pun was originally on two different but similar sounding words, *’ûrû’ēl* = Jerusalem and *’ar’ēl* or *’ᵃrî’ēl* = "underworld ghost, shade" and also "altar hearth," with one textual tradition leveling in one direction and another in the other direction. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 257-259, accepts the vocalization *’ûrû’ēl* and argues that Isaiah coined it on the basis of a threat by Sennacherib which used the Accadian form of the name Jerusalem. But Schreiner's interesting hypothesis that vss. 1-3 cite a threatening message from Sennacherib is difficult to support.

Jerusalem would hardly have been apparent on the surface to Isaiah's hearers unless his use of the word depended upon some immediate circumstance which escapes us. In any case, as soon as he introduces the word he immediately defines it by the phrase *qiryat ḥānâ dāwid*, "the city where David encamped," which is then twisted in an ironic way in the threat in verse 3 comparing Yahweh's impending siege of the city with David's siege (reading *k^{e}dāwid* with the LXX for MT *kaddûr*).[1]

The shift to the promise of deliverance probably begins with the transitional words *w^{e}hāyâ l^{e}peta^{c} pit'ōm* in verse 5c. The preceding line, verse 5ab, with its imagery of blowing dust and chaff, should probably be placed after the storm theophany language of verse 6 where it fits well as an appropriate [illegible] verses 5c,6,5ab,7-8 constitute a supplemental reinterpre[illegible]h in a later circumstance is confirmed by the shif[illegible]n oracular style of divine address in verses 1,3-4 t[illegible]yle references to both Ariel and Yahweh beginning [illegible]

---

[1] The reading *k^{e}dāwid* in vs. 3 must be correct in the light of the word play between *w^{e}hanītī k^{e}dāwid*, vs. 3, and *hānâ dāwid*, vs. 1. So Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 323, and Procksch, *Jesaia I*, p. 372.

[2] So Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 323-324, and Bright, "Isaiah--I," §440b. However, Scott's attempt to carry the threat on through vss. 5c-6 is not convincing. The verb *pqd* is frequently used of favorable as well as unfavorable divine visitations; cf. *BDB*.

[3] The verb form *tippāqēd* in vs. 6 is third person singular feminine. The textually uncertain word *zārāyik* in vs. 5a should probably be emended to *zārîm* or *zēdîm* on the basis the LXX *tōn asebōn* and the synonymous parallel *^{c}ārîṣîm* in vs. 5b; cf. IQIs^{a} *zdyk*. The intrusion of the suffix probably occurred as a secondary consequence of the line being wrongly placed after vs. 4.

Jerusalem would hardly have been apparent on the surface to Isaiah's hearers unless his use of the word depended upon some immediate circumstance which escapes us. In any case, as soon as he introduces the word he immediately defines it by the phrase *qiryat ḥānâ dāwid*, "the city where David encamped," which is then twisted in an ironic way in the threat in verse 3 comparing Yahweh's impending siege of the city with David's siege (reading *k^{e}dāwid* with the LXX for MT *kaddûr*).[1]

The shift to the promise of deliverance probably begins with the transitional words *w^{e}hāyâ l^{e}peta^{c} pit'ōm* in verse 5c. The preceding line, verse 5ab, with its imagery of blowing dust and chaff, should probably be placed after the storm theophany language of verse 6 where it fits well as an appropriate effect.[2] That verses 5c,6,5ab,7-8 constitute a supplemental reinterpretation added by Isaiah in a later circumstance is confirmed by the shift from the second person oracular style of divine address in verses 1,3-4 to the third person style references to both Ariel and Yahweh beginning in verse 6.[3]

---

[1] The reading *k^{e}dāwid* in vs. 3 must be correct in the light of the word play between *w^{e}ḥanîtî k^{e}dāwid*, vs. 3, and *ḥānâ dāwid*, vs. 1. So Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 323, and Procksch, *Jesaia I*, p. 372.

[2] So Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 323-324, and Bright, "Isaiah--I," §440b. However, Scott's attempt to carry the threat on through vss. 5c-6 is not convincing. The verb *pqd* is frequently used of favorable as well as unfavorable divine visitations; cf. *BDB*.

[3] The verb form *tippāqēd* in vs. 6 is third person singular feminine. The textually uncertain word *zārāyik* in vs. 5a should probably be emended to *zārîm* or *zēdîm* on the basis the LXX *tōn asebōn* and the synonymous parallel *^{c}ārîṣîm* in vs. 5b; cf. IQIs^{a} *zdyk*. The intrusion of the suffix probably occurred as a secondary consequence of the line being wrongly placed after vs. 4.

The brief theophany description in verses 5c-6 resembles that of Isaiah 30:27,30. It likewise draws upon the stereotyped hymnic theophany portrayals of Yahweh's holy war intervention and cosmic dominion of the same kind used elsewhere by Isaiah in dependence upon the Jerusalem cult tradition.[1]

w^{e}hāyâ *l^{e}peta^{c}* *pit’ōm* / *mē^{c}im* *yhwh* *ṣ^{e}bā’ôt* *tippāqēd*
b^{e}ra^{c}am *ûb^{e}ra^{c}aš* *w^{e}qôl* *gādôl* / *sûpâ* *ûs^{ec}ārâ* *w^{e}lahab* *’ēš* *’ôkēlâ*

The theophany intervention, especially the imagery of blowing dust and chaff representing the resulting destruction of the enemy in Isaiah 29: 5c-6,5ab,7, closely resemble the language of a curselike appeal for Yahweh's holy war theophany intervention in Psalm 83:14-16 in the context of a communal lament and also the language of another theophany victory oracle of Isaiah preserved in Isaiah 17:12-14.[2]

---

[1] The vague reference to Yahweh's coming, *mē^{c}im* *yhwh* *ṣ^{e}bā’ôt* *tippāqēd*, is analogous to *šēm-yhwh* *bā’* *mimmerḥāq*, 30:27, but avoids any indication of the place from which Yahweh's intervention proceeds. On *yhwh* *ṣ^{e}bā’ôt* in Is. 6:3,5 and its dependence on holy war and theophany traditions of the kind reflected in Ps. 24:7-10 see above, §A. To *qôl* *gādôl*, Is. 29:6, compare *qôl* *haqqôrā’* and *qôl* *’^{a}dônay*, 6:4,8, *w^{e}hišmîa^{c}* *yhwh* *’et-hôd* *qôlô*, 30:30, and *qôl* *yhwh* in the Canaanite style storm theophany description in Ps. 29. To *b^{e}ra^{c}am*, Is. 29:6, compare *qôl* *ra^{c}amkā*, Ps. 77:19, in the context of another Canaanite style theophany description reminiscent of Ps. 29; cf. Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 26-28. The phrase *lahab* *’ēš* *’ôkēlâ* which occurs in both Is. 29:6 and 30:30 (cf. 66:15) recalls *lah^{a}bôt* *’ēš* in Ps. 29:7.

[2] Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 261, 262, also notes these connections. Compare the entire half line, *sûpâ* *ûs^{ec}ārâ* *w^{e}lahab* *’ēš* *’ôkēlâ*, Is. 29:6c, with the synonymous parallelism of Ps. 83:15-16 which joins *k^{e}’ēš* with *k^{e}lehābâ* and *b^{e}sa^{ca}rekā* with *b^{e}sûpāt^{e}kā* in adjacent lines. The words *sûpâ* and *k^{e}mōṣ* in Is. 29:6c,5b occur also in Is. 17:13b, *w^{e}ruddap* *k^{e}mōṣ* *hārîm* *lipnê* *rûaḥ* / *ûk^{e}galgal* *lipnê* *sûpâ*, a line which closely resembles Ps. 83:14, *’^{e}lôhay* *šîtēmô* *kaggalgal* / *k^{e}qaš* *lipnê-rûaḥ*, and 83:16, *kēn* *tird^{e}pēm* *b^{e}sa^{ca}rekā* / *ûb^{e}sûpāt^{e}kā* *t^{e}bah^{a}lēm*, the opening and closing lines of the appeal for Yahweh's theophany intervention against the attacking enemy. Jeremias, *Theophanie*, p. 71, considers

Psalm 83 also stems from the Assyrian period, possibly even reflecting one of Sennacherib's invasions (vs. 9).[1] In describing the situation of distress, verses 3-9 mention the Assyrians climactically at the end of a list of traditional enemies of Judah, pictured as conspiring together against Israel and Yahweh. This is reminiscent of the conspiracy of the nations against Yahweh and the Davidic king in Psalm 2:1-3. In Psalm 83:10-13, the appeal for Yahweh's intervention first cites the traditions of Yahweh's holy war victories over Sisera and Jabin under Deborah and Baruch (Jud. 4-5) and over Midian under Gideon (Jud. 6-8). It then calls climactically (vss. 14-19) for his theophany intervention to force the enemy to acknowledge his name (vs. 17) and his universal sovereignty as Elyon (vs. 19). This climactic use of the title Elyon, together with the use of the verb hmh in verse 3 to describe the conspiracy of Yahweh's enemies, vaguely reflects the ancient mythological picture of Elyon's cosmic dominion over the gods and the chaotic waters. But here this has been completely demythologized and reinterpreted in terms of the premonarchic holy war tradition.[2] A similar combination of themes occurs

---

Is. 29:6 and Ps. 83:14-16 not as full-fledged theophany passages but rather as examples of the disintegration of the theophany Gattung in which Yahweh's coming is itself not portrayed but only the terrifying power of the storm as his weapon. He does not discuss Is. 17:12-14 as a theophany text at all. But the tradition of Yahweh's theophany appearance is certainly implied or presupposed in all three passages, though they do not follow the formal pattern considered normative by Jeremias.

[1] For a defense of a date in the Assyrian period see Kraus, Psalmen, II, 576-577, 578-579.

[2] On the traditions underlying Ps. 83 see especially the discussions by Kraus, Psalmen, II, 578-580, and Weiser, Psalms, pp. 562-564. See also Schreiner, Sion-Jerusalem, pp. 261-262, and Fohrer, Jesaja, I, 218-219.

in Psalm 46 where the cosmological imagery is more clear and where the verb hmh refers to the uproar of both the chaos waters (vs. 4) and the nations (vs. 7).[1]

The opening woe saying in Isaiah 17:12-14 reflects this same traditional combination of themes when it uses the same verb hmh and two derivative nouns to picture the invading Assyrians as a tumult of many nations comparable to the rebellious raging of the chaos waters (vs. 12):

> hôy h^{a}môn ^{c}ammîm rabbîm / kah^{a}môt yammîm yeh^{e}māyûn
> ûš^e'ôn l^e'ummîm kiš'ôn / mayim kabbîrîm yiššā'ûn

Similar imagery lies behind the repeated use of the noun hāmôn in Isaiah 29:5ab,7-8, picturing the Assyrian attack on Ariel as an onslaught by a multitude of nations.[2]

Both Isaiah 17:14 and 29:7 stress the suddenness and completeness of Yahweh's victory and the resulting deliverance by picturing it as occurring mysteriously and by surprise during the course of a single night (cf. w^{e}hāyâ l^{e}peta^c pit'ōm, 29:5c). This feature, also appearing in Psalm 46:6, is best explained as a theme deriving from the traditions of the Passover deliverance in Egypt and the closely associated deliverance at the Sea of Reeds, each of which occurred, according to tradition, during the course of a single night or at the break of morning (cf. Ex. 11:4; 12:12,29; 14:24,27,30).[3] The theme of divinely given victory in the middle of the night is also a traditional feature of certain holy war stories, notably Gideon against the Midianites (Jud. 7:9-22; cf. vs. 19) and Saul defending Jabesh-gilead against the Ammonites (I Sam. 11:1-13; cf. vss. 9,11).[1] Isaiah's use of the Passover tradition in his oracles promising deliverance from Assyria in Isaiah 17:14; 29:7; 31:5, may have prompted the report of the withdrawal of Sennacherib in II Kings 19:35 (= Is. 37:36; cf. II Chr. 32:21a) to be formulated as a holy war legend patterned after the Passover story. Thus Isaiah 29:1-8, along with 17:12-14, illustrates the rich heritage of tradition drawn upon by Isaiah, and also the extraordinary flexibility with which he used these traditions to depict Yahweh's acts of judgment and deliverance toward Zion.

---

[1] On Ps. 46 see above, chap. 6, §D. 26-3

[2] Note also the occurrence of hāmôn in Ps. 65:8 referring to the chaos waters and the nations in synonymous parallelism and in Is. 13:4 referring to a great army of many nations assembled by Yahweh against Babylon.

[3] This view proposed by J. Ziegler, "Die Hilfe Gottes 'am Morgen',"

H. Summary

Isaiah uses most of the major themes connected with Zion in the Psalms, especially Psalms 24, 29 and 46. The theophany and holy war traditions originally brought to Jerusalem from Shiloh with the ark cult are of central importance in his religious thought and experience and constitute the fundamental presuppositions of his oracles relating to Zion. These traditions are symbolized for him by Zion itself which has the ark and the cherubim in the temple as its cultic focal point. But the symbolism of the ark and cherubim have been largely transferred to Zion as

---

Bonner Biblische Beiträge, I: Alttestamentliche Studien, Friedrich Nötscher zum sechzigsten Geburtstag, ed. H. Junker und J. Botterweck (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1950), pp. 286-289, has been accepted by Schreiner, Sion-Jerusalem, p. 224; cf. 262, and Fohrer, Jesaja, I, 220; cf. Kraus, Psalmen, I, 345.

[1] Cf. Ziegler, "Die Hilfe Gottes 'am Morgen'," p. 288, who also cites II Chr. 20:16-17,20 and II Kgs. 3:20.

such. This is indicated by the fact that for the most part his oracles, except perhaps for his inaugural vision, allude simply to Zion rather than to the ark and cherubim symbolism specifically.

Likewise the originally Canaanite and Jebusite cosmological imagery of Yahweh's heavenly enthronement as Elyon has been assimilated so completely that, even though Isaiah never uses this title for Yahweh, he nevertheless uses the title *yhwh* *ṣᵉbā'ôt* with many of the same cosmological connotations that are associated with Elyon in the Psalms, as seen in the combination *hammelek* *yhwh* *ṣᵉbā'ôt* (6:8). Thus Zion, as the place where Yahweh dwells or manifests his theophany presence, is the earthly counterpart of his heavenly enthronement and universal cosmic dominion. Yet the traditional mythological and cosmological imagery associated with the theme of Yahweh's enthronement as the high god over a pantheon of heavenly beings is reduced to a minimum, while the theme of his dominion over the nations and over human history is stressed and magnified in terms of a variety of specific situations and circumstances. This theme of Yahweh's sovereignty over history is perhaps epitomized in his emphatic use of the title *hā'ādôn* *yhwh* *ṣᵉbā'ôt* in several threat oracles (1:24; 3:1; 10:33; 19:4). For Isaiah, Zion tends to be the central focal point and symbol of Yahweh's sovereign actions in human affairs. He executes his wrath against king and people by summoning Assyria to attack Zion. He executes his wrath against the Assyrians by defeating them at Zion. He promises to vindicate the trust of the king and the nation in him by defending and protecting Zion.

As a prophet associated with both the temple and the royal court, Isaiah probably functioned in an ancient traditional role or office as

6

such. This is indicated by the fact that for the most part his oracles, except perhaps for his inaugural vision, allude simply to Zion rather than to the ark and cherubim symbolism specifically.

Likewise the originally Canaanite and Jebusite cosmological imagery of Yahweh's heavenly enthronement as Elyon has been assimilated so completely that, even though Isaiah never uses this title for Yahweh, he nevertheless uses the title yhwh ṣᵉbā'ôt with many of the same cosmological connotations that are associated with Elyon in the Psalms, as seen in the combination hammelek yhwh ṣᵉbā'ôt (6:8). Thus Zion, as the place where Yahweh dwells or manifests his theophany presence, is the earthly counterpart of his heavenly enthronement and universal cosmic dominion. Yet the traditional myt [illegible] mological imagery associated with the theme of Yahweh's [illegible] high god over a pantheon of heavenly beings is r [illegible] ile the theme of his dominion over the nations and [illegible] stressed and magnified in terms of a variety of specific [illegible] circumstances. This theme of Yahweh's sovereignty over history is perhaps epitomized in his emphatic use of the title hā'ādôn yhwh ṣᵉbā'ôt in several threat oracles (1:24; 3:1; 10:33; 19:4). For Isaiah, Zion tends to be the central focal point and symbol of Yahweh's sovereign actions in human affairs. He executes his wrath against king and people by summoning Assyria to attack Zion. He executes his wrath against the Assyrians by defeating them at Zion. He promises to vindicate the trust of the king and the nation in him by defending and protecting Zion.

As a prophet associated with both the temple and the royal court, Isaiah probably functioned in an ancient traditional role or office as the mediator of oracular messages received charismatically and perhaps in symbolic connection with the ark cult of the temple. This is epitomized in at least two formulas:

mē^{c}im *yhwh* *ṣ^{e}bā'ôt* / *haššôkēn* *b^{e}har* *ṣiyyôn* (8:18b)

n^{e}'um *yhwh* / *'^{a}šer-'ûr* *lô* *b^{e}ṣiyyôn* / *w^{e}tannûr* *lô* *bîrûšālēm* (31:9b)

Thus he is acting in his official capacity when he delivers oracles and counsel to the king and to the nation, as a cultic community, in specific situations of military and political crisis. As a divinely commissioned spokesman who has been initiated into Yahweh's heavenly council, which he envisions in terms of the traditional cosmological enthronement imagery of the ark and cherubim at Zion, he interprets with authority and conviction the meaning of the dynastic covenant traditions and the traditions concerning Yahweh's kingship at Zion. In his oracles he exercises great freedom in drawing out of these traditions radical implications for the specific political and military decisions confronting the king and the nation.

Two points are characteristic of Isaiah's radical interpretation of Zion as a theological symbol of the meaning of the crisis events and decisions in which the nation was involved. First and fundamentally, Zion symbolizes security through a kind of exclusive trust in Yahweh which requires abandonment of trust in all humanly based forms of security. This theme, which derives ultimately from the holy war traditions of the premonarchic period and the holy war symbolism of the ark and of Zion itself, is the basis for the oracular advice he gives in situations of military invasion and threatened siege, both during the Syro-Ephraimitic war in the reign of Ahaz and during the Assyrian campaigns in the reign of

Hezekiah. In the face of these threats to the existence of the nation and Zion itself, Isaiah encourages the king to stand firm, without panic or surrender. At the same time he denounces every action or decision that seems to reflect trust in foreign alliances and military power rather than trust in Yahweh's promises of holy war deliverance symbolized by Zion. Several of the interrelated embryonic oracles and other formula-like sayings analyzed in this chapter express this theme and reveal its dependence upon the symbolic meaning of Zion, the Davidic covenant traditions, and the theme of holy war:

kî *yhwh* *yissad* *ṣiyyôn* / *ûbô* *yeḥ^{e}sû* *^{ca}niyyê* *^{c}ammi* (14:32b)
hin^{e}nî *m^{e}yassēd* *b^{e}ṣiyyôn* *’eben* ... *hamma’^{a}mîn* *lō’* *yāḥîš* (28:16)
’im *lô’* *ta’^{a}mînû* / *kî* *lô’* *tē’āmēnû* (7:9b)
hiššāmēr *w^{e}hašqēṭ* *’al-tîrā’* *ûl^{e}bāb^{e}kā* *’al-yērak* (7:4)
b^{e}šûbâ *wānaḥat* *tiwwāšē^{c}ûn* / *b^{e}hašqēṭ* *ûb^{e}biṭḥâ* *tihyeh* *g^{e}bûratkem* (30:15b)
^{c}immānû *’ēl* (7:14; 8:8,10)

A second characteristic of Isaiah's interpretation of Zion as a theological symbol is a radical tension between divine judgment and divine deliverance, both of which he depicts in terms of holy war theophany visitations focused upon Zion. The traditional themes become very flexible and adaptable in his hands as he relates them to changing historical circumstances and to varying human responses. As an example of this, the ambiguous saying *š^{e}’ār* *yāšûb* could be interpreted as either a threat or a promise or both at once, and could be applied either to some other nation or to Zion. In fact, he sees Yahweh as acting in terms of a sovereign plan, and yet repeatedly changing and even reversing himself in reaction to varied human responses and actions. Isaiah confronts Ahaz with promises of the holy war deliverance of Jerusalem. But when Ahaz fails to respond with trust, the promises become the basis for devastating threats. The Assyrians become a holy war weapon in the hand of Yahweh, which he turns against Zion as his wrath thunders forth from Zion in the oracles of Isaiah. Yet, in the time of Hezekiah, oracles threatening devastation against Zion were supplemented and transformed into oracles promising theophany interventions against the Assyrians on behalf of Zion (29:1-8; 31:4-5,8-9). According to the Kings narratives concerning Isaiah and Hezekiah, oracles of deliverance were given in response to an act of complete trust and self-abandonment to Yahweh. But in several of the oracles, as well as the narratives, Yahweh's decision to defend and deliver Zion was a response to the self-deifying arrogance of the Assyrians, who planned to bring their conquest of the world to a climax by conquering Jerusalem in scornful disregard and defiance of Yahweh and his purposes.

Despite this flexibility, however, Zion is not primarily a symbol of Yahweh's changeableness and responsiveness. Rather, it is a symbol of his changeless reliability and trustworthiness. It represents his inmost purpose of manifesting his universal sovereignty over Israel and the world through deliverance and salvation. Thus Zion is the divinely founded symbol of security for Yahweh's people which can never be overthrown and destroyed by any human power. Yet Zion, as such, has no a priori divine guarantee of inviolability. Instead, it only points to the security to be found in trusting Yahweh.

CHAPTER VIII. THE DECLINE OF ZION AS A THEOLOGICAL SYMBOL IN THE LAST CENTURY OF THE JUDEAN MONARCHY

After the time of Isaiah and Hezekiah the reign of Manasseh brought with it a long period of complete submission to Assyria. According to II Kings 21, it was also the longest and most thoroughgoing period of paganism in the history of Judah.[1] The various cults attacked in Zephaniah 1:2-6 and the great list of foreign and domestic cults suppressed by Josiah according to II Kings 23:4-14,24 illustrate the situation that developed under Manasseh. Willingly or unwillingly, Manasseh abandoned Hezekiah's reform and reverted to the policies of Ahaz. This does not necessarily mean that the Yahwistic cult of the temple was totally displaced. But it probably was reduced to little more than the status of one cult among many. Under these circumstances the old traditional holy war themes associated with the ark and Zion must have become almost meaningless for all but a minority.[2] This helps to explain why the Zion traditions and the word Zion itself do not play a significant role in the Yahwistic revival movements during the latter part of the seventh century after the decline of Assyria.

---

[1] On the political and religious situation during Manasseh's reign see Bright, History, pp. 288-291, Noth, History, pp. 268-269, Robinson in Oesterley and Robinson, History, I, 400-404, von Rad, Theology, I, 62, and H. B. MacLean, "Manasseh," §2. "King of Judah," IDB, III, 254-255.

[2] Bright, History, p. 291, notes the accusation in Zeph. 1:12 against those who are sceptical of Yahweh's ability to act in any way in human events. Cf. von Rad, Theology, II, 263.

A. Zion and the Deuteronomic Reform Theology

Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic reform were dominated by a quite different constellation of traditions. The theme of holy war, and the attempt to revive its practice as carried on in premonarchic times, is indeed prominent in Deuteronomy.[1] But holy war in Deuteronomy is placed in the traditional setting of the covenant and the giving of the land of Canaan. In no way is it associated with Zion or the defense of Jerusalem or with the ark. In the Deuteronomic tradition the ark, called *ʼᵃrôn bᵉrît yhwh*, functions simply as the container for the stone tablets inscribed with the ten commandments brought down by Moses from the mountain (Deut. 10:1-9; cf. 31:9,24-29).[2] Deuteronomy is distinctive in these and other respects, probably because it derived from north Israelite covenant traditions brought to Judah sometime after the fall of the Northern Kingdom.[3]

---

[1] Von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, pp. 49-59, and *Heilige Krieg*, pp. 68-78, notes numerous laws with parenetic expansion concerning holy war in Deut. 20; 21:10-14; 23:10-15; 24:5; 25:17-19, parenetic sections interpreting holy war in 7:16-26; 9:1-6; 31:3-8, and an atmosphere of holy war in many other passages such as 6:18; 7:1-2; 11:22-25; 12:29; 19:1. See also his discussions of these passages in *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*, pp. 131-133, 137, 146-147, 155, and the discussions by Wright, "Deuteronomy," pp. 455-459, 460-461, 482.

[2] The phrase *ʼᵃrôn bᵉrît yhwh* or near equivalents also occurs several times in the Deuteronomic history as in Josh. 3-6 *passim*; I Kgs. 3:15; 6:19; 8:1,6; cf. Jer. 3:16 (contrast simply *ʼᵃrôn yhwh*, *ʼᵃrôn hāʼᵉlôhîm* or the like for the most part in I Sam. 3-6 + II Sam. 6 *passim*). On the ark in Josh. 3-6 see above, chap. 1, §B. On I Kgs. 8:1-13 see chap. 2, §D.

[3] On the northern and non-Jerusalemite origins of Deuteronomy see especially A. Alt, "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums" (1953), *KS*, II, 250-275, G. von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, pp. 40-41, 60-69, *Theology*, I, 70-75, "Deuteronomy," *IDB*, I, 836-837, and *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*, pp. 23-27, Wright, "Deuteronomy," pp. 323-326, Weiser, *The Old Testament*,

The most significant point of contact between Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem cultic tradition occurs in those passages which demand centralization of the cult *bammāqôm* *ʾ^{a}šer-yibḥar* *yhwh* (with minor variations 12:14,18,26; 14:25; 15:20; 16:7,15,16; 17:8,10; 18:6; 31:11), often with the additional alliterative formula *l^{e}šakkēn* *š^{e}mô* *šām* (12:11; 14:23; 16:2,6,11) or *lāśûm* *š^{e}mô* *šām* (12:5,21; 14:24). Variations of this formula or parts of it also occur in the Deuteronomic history referring explicitly to Jerusalem and the temple (I Kgs. 8:16,44,48; 11:13,32,36; 14:21; II Kgs. 21:7; 23:27; also Neh. 1:9; cf. II Sam. 7:13; I Kgs. 5:17,19; 18:17-20,29; 9:3).[1] The passages in Deuteronomy where this demand is made are limited to seven significant units of material (12; 14:22-29; 15:19-23; 16:1-17; 17:8-13; 18:1-18; 19:1-13).[2] These perhaps reflect additions made to adapt the traditions brought from the north to the reforming purposes of those who compiled and edited the material in the south.[3] The desire to centralize the cult in Jerusalem probably did not originate with Deuteronomy and the reform movement of Josiah since such an impulse seems to have been already operative in Hezekiah's reform.[4] In both

---

pp. 131-132, Davies, "Deuteronomy," §231d-e, Gray, *Kings*, pp. 652-655, and de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 338-339.

[1] These lists of references are based on Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem*, pp. 158-159.

[2] See von Rad, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*, p. 16, and "Deuteronomy," p. 834.

[3] See von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, pp. 67-68, "Deuteronomy," p. 834, and *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*, pp. 16-17, 88-94. However, von Rad thinks that the idea of a central, though not sole and exclusive, Yahwistic cult place may already have been an element in the Deuteronomic tradition deriving ultimately from the premonarchic Israelite tribal league.

[4] This is argued especially by Wright, "Deuteronomy," pp. 324-325,

cases it developed out of the traditional primacy of Jerusalem in the south combined with the desire to eliminate syncretistic and pagan practices and to re-establish political independence from Assyria.

The Deuteronomic teaching that Jerusalem and the temple are the place Yahweh has chosen to put his name must represent an interpretation of the old Jerusalem tradition that the coming of the ark symbolized Yahweh's election of Zion. These traditions are probably reflected both in the occasional use of the verb _škn_ piel (Deut. 12:11; 14; 23; 16:2,6,11; cf. 12:5) and in the _šēm_ theology itself.[1] In an illuminating discussion of the Deuteronomic "name" theology, especially as expressed in the Deuteronomic prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the temple (I Kgs. 8:22-53), Clements argues that the reformers were trying to eliminate every remnant of Canaanite-style mythological and magical thinking concerning Yahweh's presence in the temple or concerning the connection between the temple and heaven. They did this by emphasizing Yahweh's oneness and transcendence.[2] Thus the vertical typology, in which Yahweh's theophany presence and enthronement in connection with the ark and cherubim in the temple is the earthly manifestation of his cosmic dominion, was replaced by the idea that he had put his "name" in the temple while he himself dwelt exclusively in heaven. This is illustrated in Solomon's

---

and Gray, _Kings_, pp. 652-655; cf. de Vaux, _Ancient Israel_, pp. 331-339.

[1] On _škn_ as alluding to Yahweh's theophany presence or manifestation in connection with the ark see above, chap. 2, §D. On the connection between the _šēm_ theology and the ark see Schreiner, _Sion-Jerusalem_, pp. 158-164, and the discussions above, chap. 1, §F, and chap. 5, §F.

[2] Clements, _God and Temple_, pp. 88-99; cf. von Rad, _Theology_, I, 226-231.

prayer (I Kgs. 8:22-53), an obviously Deuteronomic reinterpretation of the symbolism of the installation of the ark in the temple. In sharp contrast to the ancient dedicatory poem in verses 12-13, the prayer emphatically rejects the use of the verb yšb to refer to Yahweh's presence in the temple and makes it refer exclusively to his dwelling or enthronement in heaven (vss. 27,30,39,43,49).[1] The presence of Yahweh's "name" in the temple represents his gracious willingness to hear and answer from heaven the prayers and supplications offered toward the temple (vss. 29, 44,48). Holy war deliverance is symbolized by the temple and the ark in only one sense. Prayers for deliverance from defeat and exile caused by sin against Yahweh are among the kinds of prayers Yahweh may hear and answer (I Kgs. 8:33-34; cf. vss. 46-50).

B. Zion as a Symbol of Judgment in Micah and Zephaniah

In contrast to Isaiah, the prophets of the late seventh and early sixth centuries agree with Deuteronomy in placing little emphasis on distinctive Zion themes. In addition to the influence of the Deuteronomic movement there may be a further reason for this. Already in the time of Isaiah the prophet Micah had proclaimed the final and irreversible destruction of Zion and the temple (Mic. 3:9-12).[2] Micah 1 shows that

---

[1] On I Kgs. 8:12-13 see above, chap. 2, §D. Gray, Kings, pp. 205-206, is probably correct in preferring the translation "enthrone" for the verb yšb in I Kgs. 8.

[2] On Micah's radical expectation of a total and final divine judgment upon Jerusalem and its ruling class together with a corresponding final end of Zion and the temple see A. Alt, "Micha 2:1-5, GĒS ANADASMOS in Juda" (1955), KS, III, 373-381, followed by von Rad, Theology, II, 150, 171-172, 176; cf. Harrelson, Interpreting the Old Testament, pp. 365-366. On the basis of Mic. 5:1-5 Alt and von Rad argue that Micah

Micah adopted traditional Zion holy war theophany imagery to portray Yahweh's devastating intervention against Israel, Judah and Jerusalem. The summons to the nations to hear the verdict of judgment (vs. 2) reflects in a demythologized form the traditional picture of Yahweh as Elyon summoning the heavenly council as in Psalm 82:1 and Deuteronomy 32:1,8.[1] Yahweh's theophany intervention and the resulting devastation of the mountains are portrayed in archaic terms deriving from the holy war hymnic theophany tradition associated with the ark and cherubim in the Jerusalem cult tradition.[2] Yahweh is pictured as coming from his heavenly dwelling place, *yôṣē’ mimmᵉqômô wᵉyārad* (vs. 3). The temple at Zion is its earthly counterpart as seen in the expression *mēhêkal qodšô* (vs. 2).[3] The accusation and following verdict are directed against the Northern Kingdom and especially Samaria which is to be utterly destroyed (vss.

---

also expected the final destruction of the Davidic dynasty itself and the divine designation of a new ruler from Bethlehem who would deliver Judah from Assyria but would never again rule at Jerusalem.

[1] Cf. Harrelson, *Interpreting the Old Testament*, pp. 363-364. On the theme of the heavenly council as a kind of jury to hear Yahweh's covenant lawsuits see Huffmon, "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," pp. 285-295, and Wright, "The Lawsuit of God," pp. 41-58. On the relation of Ps. 82:1 and Deut. 32:1,8 to Jerusalem cultic traditions see above, chap. 4, §C.

[2] On Mic. 1:3-4 as a classic example of the hymnic theophany *Gattung* see Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 11-13, 130, 148, 159. In vs. 4 the words *wᵉnamassû hehārîm taḥtāyw* ... *kaddônag mippᵉnê hā’ēš* closely resemble Ps. 97:5; cf. 68:3. On the association of this theophany imagery with the ark and cherubim on the one hand and with Elyon traditions on the other in Ps. 97, see above, chap. 4, §E. Cf. W. Beyerlin, *Die Kulttraditionen Israels in der Verkündigung des Propheten Micha* (FRLANT, 72; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), pp. 30-42.

[3] Cf. A. Weiser, *Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten*, I: *Die Propheten Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona, Micha* (ATD, 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949), 208.

5a,6-7).[1] But the oracle then continues, or is subsequently supplemented by Micah, to extend the threat to include Judah and Jerusalem itself (vss. 8-16).[2] This indicates that the devastation of Samaria at the hands of the Assyrians in 722 may have confirmed to Micah that the same fate lay in store for Jerusalem. Similar imagery is used both with reference to the destruction of Samaria in 1:6 and with reference to Zion in 3:12. Thus Micah, in contrast to Isaiah, turned the holy war theophany symbolism of Zion against Zion uncompromisingly, totally negating and rejecting the traditional symbolism of divine presence and holy war deliverance associated with Zion. He placed his climactic announcement of the destruction of Zion in 3:12 in explicit contradiction to the Zion theology, cited sarcastically in verse 11c, *h^{a}lô’ yhwh b^{e}qirbēnû* / *lô’-tābô’ ^{c}ālênû rā^{c}â*.[3] Thus, for Micah, Zion ceased to be a symbol of anything except judgment and doom.[4]

---

[1] The reference to Judah and Jerusalem in vs. 5c must be regarded as a later addition since the following threat is directed only against Samaria; cf. Alt, "Micha 2:1-5," p. 373, Donner, *Israel unter den Völkern*, p. 97, and Weiser, *Kleine Propheten*, I, 209.

[2] On the links tying vss. 2-7,8-9,10-16 together see especially Donner, *Israel unter den Völkern*, pp. 95-100; cf. Alt, "Micha 2:1-5," p. 373.

[3] See Ps. 46:6, *’^{e}lôhîm b^{e}qirbāh bal-timmôṭ* / *ya^{c}z^{e}rehā ’^{e}lôhîm lipnôt bōqer*, referring to the ark as the symbol of Yahweh's protective holy war presence in Zion, see above chap. 6, §D.

[4] The oracles of promise concerning Zion in Mic. 4 cannot be attributed to Micah with any confidence; cf. Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, pp. 410-411, Weiser, *The Old Testament*, pp. 254-255, and Thomas, "Micah," §§552b,553g-554a. Some such as Harrelson, *Interpreting the Old Testament*, p. 367, find a fragment of a genuine oracle in 4:9-10a with its personification of *bat-ṣiyyôn* as a woman in travail and its threat that she will be driven out into the open country. This agrees basically with 3:12.

Using different traditions the prophet Zephaniah likewise proclaimed uncompromising doom upon Jerusalem during the years just prior to the Deuteronomic reform.[1] Though possibly connected with the royal family through descent from Hezekiah (1:1), he made little recognizable use of specifically Zion traditions. Even the word Zion is lacking in portions of the book deriving from Zephaniah, despite the fact that his threats in 1:2-2:3; 3:1-7 focus primarily upon Jerusalem. Instead, as the basis of his threats, he used the theme of the day of Yahweh (1:7,14, 18; 2:2-3). Used previously by Amos and Isaiah in threats directed against the Northern Kingdom, this theme was not specifically a Jerusalem tradition.[2] More clearly than they, Zephaniah pictured the day of Yahweh as an imminent catastrophe of cosmic and universal proportions (1:2-3, 17-18).[3] Yet he focused its threat primarily upon Jerusalem.

---

[1] This is the commonly accepted date for Zephaniah; cf. Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, p. 124, Weiser, *The Old Testament*, p. 265, and Harrelson, *Interpreting the Old Testament*, p. 379. An exception is J. P. Hyatt, "Zephaniah," *PCB*, §560, who suggests the reign of Jehoiakim.

[2] See Am. 5:18-20 and Is. 2:9-22 (cf. *bêt ya^{ca}qōb*, 2:6). These passages may indicate that the day of Yahweh was primarily a northern tradition, though known also in the south. In any case there is no evidence that it was a specifically Jerusalem tradition. On its origin in connection with the holy war theme of Yahweh's day of victory in battle see H. W. Robinson, *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament* (London: Oxford University Press, 1946), pp. 138-143, and G. von Rad, "The Origin of the Concept of the Day of Yahweh," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, IV (1959), 97-108, and *Theology*, II, 119-125. Wildberger, *Jesaja*, p. 107, finds an intermingling of Zion and day-of-Yahweh themes in Is. 2:12-17. On the redirection of other traditional holy war concepts against Israel in Am. 2:14-16; 5:3, see von Rad, *Heilige Krieg*, p. 63. Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 97-100, regards the theophany *Gattung* and the day-of-Yahweh traditions as distinct themes which influenced each other.

[3] On the universality of the impending doom see Horst in T. H. Robinson and F. Horst, *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten* (HAT, 14; 2. Aufl., Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1954), pp. 187-188, 191. The attempt of K. Elliger, *Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten*, II: *Die Propheten Nahum,*

C. Jeremiah's Rejection of Zion Deliverance Traditions

While Zephaniah's continuing influence cannot be observed directly, Micah's oracle against Zion had a great impact, not only on his own contemporaries, but also upon Jeremiah's contemporaries a century later. This is shown by the reference to it in Jeremiah 26:16-19 in connection with the trial of Jeremiah after his announcement of the impending destruction of the temple. The memory of Micah's oracle and its results is introduced into the debate over Jeremiah's fate by *’ᵃnāšîm mizziqnê hā’āreṣ* (vs. 17), indicating that the Micah traditions had been kept alive especially in Judean Yahwistic circles outside of Jerusalem. The Amos and Micah traditions, as well as the northern Hosea and pre-Deuteronomic traditions, may have been handed down in such non-Jerusalem, possibly Levitical, circles, though one cannot say to what extent these various circles of traditionists were interrelated or identical.[1] It does seem clear, however, that Hosea and Deuteronomy have so much common ground thematically as to indicate some kind of influence or interaction at the oral tradition stage.[2] That Jeremiah was primarily influenced by non-Zion traditions akin to Hosea and Deuteronomy is widely acknowledged.[3]

Habakuk, Zephanja, Haggai, Sacharja, Maleachi (ATD, 25; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1950), 55-63, to treat as secondary passages which imply universality is arbitrary; cf. Hyatt, "Zephaniah," §561a.

[1] Harrelson, *Interpreting the Old Testament*, pp. 316-318, 361-363, thinks all were preserved in identical circles.

[2] This constitutes one of the major foundations of the theory of the northern provenance of Deuteronomy. See above, §A; cf. von Rad, *Theology*, II, 139-140, who cites H. W. Wolff, "Hoseas geistige Heimat," *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, LXXXI (1956), 83-94.

[3] On Hosea's influence on Jeremiah see E. A. Leslie, *Jeremiah*

Jeremiah's defenders cite Micah's oracle as a precedent for Jeremiah's similar threat. This indicates that Jeremiah would probably also have known the Micah traditions and regarded Micah's oracle against Zion as a precedent for his own threat.[1] Other non-Jerusalem prophets may have been uttering similar oracles at this time, as indicated by the story of the martyrdom of the prophet Uriah from Kiriath-jearim inserted by the editor at 26:20-23. But the basic precedent, cited by Jeremiah in the speeches attributed to him, is the tradition of the destruction of Shiloh (7:12,14; 26:6,9). In the Jerusalem traditions, as represented by the ark story of I Samuel 4-6 + II Samuel 6 (cf. I Sam. 2-3) and Psalm 78: 56-69, the destruction of Shiloh as a divine judgment was coupled with the theme of the election of Zion in its stead.[2] But Jeremiah turned these Zion traditions concerning the fate of Shiloh against Zion by announcing the same fate for Zion itself.[3]

Chronologically Arranged, Translated and Interpreted (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954), pp. 25-40, von Rad, Theology, II, 192, J. Bright, Jeremiah: Introduction, Translation and Notes (The Anchor Bible, 21; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1965), p. lxxxviii, Paterson, "Jeremiah," §467bc, and J. Skinner, Prophecy and Religion: Studies in the Life of Jeremiah (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922), pp. 21-22, 63-65. On the influence of Deuteronomy on Jeremiah which is sometimes contested see H. H. Rowley, "The Prophet Jeremiah and the Book of Deuteronomy," Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, pp. 157-174, Bright, pp. lxxxii-lxxxiv, xci-xcvi, and Skinner, pp. 89-107. For the alternative theory that Jeremiah did not support Josiah's reform see J. P. Hyatt, "The Book of Jeremiah: Introduction and Exegesis," IB, V (1956), 780-781.

[1] See Harrelson, Interpreting the Old Testament, pp. 263-264.

[2] See above, chap. 1, §D, chap. 2, §E, chap. 5, §A.

[3] Jeremiah's use of the Shiloh tradition in this way might be connected with the possibility that he was from a priestly family at Anathoth (1:1; cf. 11:21-23) descended from David's priest Abiathar who was exiled to Anathoth by Solomon and who was in turn probably a descendant of the

In contrast to the book of Isaiah, the book of Jeremiah uses the term Zion much less frequently than Jerusalem.[1] Among the oracles and poems of Jeremiah of uncontested genuineness, almost the only occurrences of the term Zion are in poems on the unidentified foe from the north (4:6,31; 6:2,23; cf. 13:20-27) or other similar poems bewailing the fate of Zion (8:19; 9:18; cf. 14:19).[2] The attacks of the enemy culminate at Zion. The descriptions of the enemy from the north do not fit any one enemy nation specifically. Instead they use traditional language with vaguely mythological overtones reminiscent of similar descriptions in Isaiah (especially Is. 5:26-29; 10:3; 14:31; 17:12-13) and Habakkuk 1:5-11.[3] This traditional language may be ultimately connected with the allusive pictures of chaotic powers and unnamed enemies attacking Zion in the songs of Zion (Pss. 46:3-4,7; 48:5-8; 76:3,6).[4] But, in contrast to

---

priestly family of Eli at Shiloh which had fled to Nob; cf. above chap. 1, §G, chap. 2, §A, and Bright, Jeremiah, pp. lxxxvii-lxxxviii.

[1] See chap. 3, §C.

[2] The date of these poems need not be decided here. On the common dating in Josiah's reign based on the traditional identification of the foe from the north with the Scythian incursions described by Herodotus, History, I:103-105, see Skinner, Prophecy and Religion, pp. 35-52. For a denial of this identification and an alternative identification with the Babylonians in the reign of Jehoiakim see C. F. Whitley, The Exilic Age (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957), pp. 36-41, Hyatt, "Jeremiah," pp. 779-780, and with less certainty, Bright, Jeremiah, pp. lxxx-lxxxii. Leslie, Jeremiah, p. 51, is perhaps on safer ground when he adopts the view that the identity of the enemy was at first unknown to Jeremiah himself. It is not certain whether the identification of the foe from the north with the Babylonians in 25:1-14 is authentic. The shorter LXX lacks all the references to the Babylonians found in MT; cf. Bright, pp. 156-163.

[3] On these similarities see B. S. Childs, "The Enemy from the North and the Chaos Tradition," JBL, LXXVIII (1959), 190-192.

[4] See above, chap. 6, §§A,C,D.

the songs of Zion and Isaiah, Jeremiah never makes use of the Zion tradition to indicate a possibility of holy war deliverance. Instead, after the battle of Carchemish, he continued to proclaim the destruction of the city (19:1-20:6) and rejected as false and deceptive various prophetic and priestly assurances of deliverance which may have been based in part on Zion and temple traditions.[1]

Though Jeremiah frequently expressed passionate sorrow over the impending fate of Jerusalem, he was so completely alienated from Zion holy war traditions of the type used by Isaiah that his hopes for the future were hardly based on it at all.[2] The only expression of hope involving Zion generally regarded as genuine is the undatable promise, based on Yahweh's covenant love, that pilgrimages to Zion from the old Northern Kingdom will be resumed as part of a general return to normalcy (31:2-6).[3]

---

[1] Jer. 7:4; cf. 5:12-13; 6:13-15 = 8:10-12; 14:13-16; 23:9-40; 27-28; 29:24-32. Except perhaps for 7:4 these passages do not suggest that such assurances of deliverance were based on any belief in the inviolability of Zion or the temple though interpreters commonly assume such a belief existed on the basis of the deliverance from Sennacherib under Hezekiah. So for example Bright, History, pp. 305, 311, 314, Jeremiah, pp. xcvii-xcviii, Leslie, Jeremiah, p. 117; cf. R. E. Clements, Prophecy and Covenant (SBT, 43; London: SCM Press, 1965), pp. 50-51, and God and Temple, pp. 83-86, 100. On Jeremiah's rejection of holy war ideas in any form see the remarks of de Vaux, Ancient Israel, p. 265.

[2] On the element of passionate feeling for Zion in Jeremiah's poems on the foe from the north see von Rad, Theology, II, 195-196.

[3] The genuineness of this passage is accepted without doubt by Skinner, Prophecy and Religion, pp. 300, 304-305, Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 361, Hyatt, "Jeremiah," pp. 1022-1023, 1028, Paterson, "Jeremiah," §483, and Bright, Jeremiah, pp. 284-286. On the other hand, the genuineness of 30:16-17 which seems to presuppose the fall of Jerusalem is rejected by Skinner, Hyatt and Paterson and debated by Bright; 31:10-14, which presupposes the exile and is reminiscent of Deutero-Isaiah, is rejected by Skinner, Hyatt and Bright; 3:14-18, which presupposes the removal of the ark and the depopulation of Jerusalem, is rejected by Skinner, p. 80, and Hyatt, pp. 823, 827, and strongly doubted by Paterson,

Other less certainly authentic expressions of hope for the restoration of Zion are notably sober and restrained, promising little more outwardly than a restoration of previous conditions.[1]

D. The Failure of Zion as a Symbol of Deliverance in Lamentations

One must indeed assume that the ancient symbolism of Zion as expressed in the Psalms and used by Isaiah continued to be celebrated in traditional ways in the temple cultus. A distorted revival of this symbolism is the probable basis for the delusive and semi-pagan promises of inevitable divine deliverance given by priests and cult prophets which Jeremiah denounced so fiercely. But the fall of Jerusalem dealt a death blow to these promises, as can be seen in the book of Lamentations.[2] In these laments over the destruction and desecration of Zion the burden of guilt is laid in a special way upon the priests and prophets who had made such promises rather than warning the nation of its guilt (Lam. 2:14; 4:13).[3] Indeed, Yahweh executed his judgment precisely by withholding

---

§470d, and Bright, p. 27. The lengthy composite oracle against Babylon in 50-51 which has five occurrences of the word Zion (50:5,28; 51:10,24, 35) is universally dated in the latter part of the exile. The genuineness of other expressions of hope for the restoration of Jerusalem or the temple which lack the word Zion is also widely doubted, 17:12-13, 19-27; 31:38-40; 33.

[1] See von Rad, *Theology*, II, 211-212, 270, who cites 30:18-19; 32:15; 33:4-11, in addition to 31:6.

[2] Cf. Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 100-101.

[3] Since the poems are so obviously cultic in character and dependent on Zion traditions, Kraus, *Klagelieder*, pp. 15, 39-40, 46-48, 78-79, suggests that some of them may have been composed by men who had given such promises and now acknowledge their sin.

his holy war deliverance and by himself turning as a fierce warrior against Zion (2:3-8; cf. 1:6-7,14-15).[1] He purposely destroyed the illusion of Jerusalem's inviolability (4:11-12).[2] The unique and momentous nature of the catastrophe as a divine act of judgment appears most clearly of all when depicted in terms of the traditional theme of the day of Yahweh, *b^{e}yôm h^{a}rôn 'appô* (1:12), *b^{e}yôm 'appô* (2:1), *b^{e}yôm 'appekā* (2:21), *b^{e}yôm 'ap-yhwh* (2:22).[3] The oracles of those prophets who proclaimed the destruction of Zion have thus been fulfilled (2:17; 5:18; cf. 1:18).[4]

The book of Lamentations likewise shows how the fall of Jerusalem threatened to destroy the meaning of Zion as the symbol of Yahweh's presence and kingship. The destruction of Zion and the ark cut the link between Yahweh's heavenly enthronement and its earthly representation. The cloud, which symbolized his theophany intervention and presence, has become a symbol of wrath against Zion (2:1).[5] The destruction of Zion and the ark is portrayed in the imagery of Yahweh casting them down from heaven (2:1).[1] This image may reflect the ancient mythological theme of the high god casting down a rebellious subordinate being. He has destroyed the fortifications of Zion which symbolized his holy war protection (2:5-8; cf. Pss. 48:4,14; 76:3; 122:7).[2] Thus the destruction of Jerusalem forced a radical rethinking of the significance of the ark and the temple at Zion as the symbols of Yahweh's presence and action.[3] One starting point for this rethinking was the dramatic juxtaposition of the traditional hymnic affirmation that Yahweh's throne of dominion endures eternally with a climactic picture of the destruction of Zion as its earthly symbol (5:18-19).[4]

---

[1] Cf. N. K. Gottwald, *Studies in the Book of Lamentations* (SBT, 14; rev. ed., London: SCM Press, 1962), pp. 74-77, 85-86.

[2] Cf. T. J. Meek, "The Book of Lamentations: Introduction and Exegesis," *IB*, VI (1956), 32, and Kraus, *Klagelieder*, p. 78.

[3] Gottwald, *Lamentations*, pp. 83-90.

[4] Cf. Kraus, *Klagelieder*, pp. 33, 47-48, 90. The saying in 5:18 is reminiscent of Mic. 3:12 and Jer. 26:9.

[5] On the implications of *yā^{c}îb b^{e}'appô yhwh 'et-bat-ṣiyyôn* (2:1) see *^{c}āb* in Ps. 18:10-13 (= II Sam. 22:10-13); 104:3; Is. 19:1; Jud. 5:4; cf. Ps. 68:5; I Kgs. 8:12, and the discussions above, chap. 1, §E, chap. 2, §D, chap. 4, §A, chap. 5, §D.

^{c}al *har-ṣiyyôn* *šeššāmēm* / *šû^{c}ālîm* *hill^{e}kû-bô*
’attâ *yhwh* *l^{ec}ôlām* *tēšēb* / *kis’^{a}kā* *l^{e}dôr* *wādôr*

---

[1] The expression *tip’eret* *yiśrā’ēl* and its synonymous parallel *h^{a}dôm-raglāyw* reflect traditional ways of referring to the ark as seen in Pss. 78:61; 89:18; 96:6; 99:5; 132:7; I Chr. 28:2; cf. Davies, "The Ark in the Psalms," p. 53, and "Ark of the Covenant," p. 225, and the discussions above, chap. 1, §E, chap. 4, §F, chap. 5, §E. In Lam. 2:1, however, the ark is not distinguished clearly from Zion itself. On *hišlîk* *miššāmayim* *’ereṣ* as a vague mythological allusion see Kraus, *Klagelieder*, pp. 41-42, and Is. 14:12-15; Ezek. 28:12-19 (cf. *^{c}al-ereṣ hišlaktîkā*, vs. 17), as discussed above, chap. 6, §B; cf. Gottwald, *Lamentations*, p. 57.

[2] In Lam. 2:6 *śukkô* is a spelling variant for *sukkô*; cf. Ps. 76:3 and *BDB*, *KB*. On the symbolic significance of *’arm^{e}nôteyhā*, vss. 5,7, and *ḥêl*, vs. 8, see Pss. 48:4,14; 122:7 as discussed above, chap. 6, §§C,E.

[3] Cf. Clements, *God* *and* *Temple*, p. 100.

[4] Cf. Porteous, "Jerusalem-Zion," pp. 244-246, and Meek, "Lamentations," p. 38, and Pss. 9:8; 93:2; 102:13; 103:19.

E. Ezekiel's Reinterpretation of the Cosmic Enthronement Symbolism of the Ark and Cherubim

Another attempt to wrestle with this problem was made by Ezekiel even before the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in 587. As one would expect of a Jerusalem priest (cf. 1:3), he makes extensive use of the traditional theophany and enthronement symbolism of the ark and cherubim (Ezek. 1:4-28; 8:2-4; 10; 11:22-25; 43:1-9), although, quite remarkably, he never uses the word Zion itself or the closely associated divine title Yahweh Sabaoth with its holy war implications.[1] Engaging in searching theological reflection by means of this traditional imagery, which he elaborates in grotesque and visionary ways, he seeks new means of giving symbolic expression to Yahweh's universal dominion in the face of the desecration and destruction of the temple as its earthly symbol.[2] He presupposes the traditional typological correspondence between Yahweh's cosmic enthronement and its earthly counterpart in the temple as does the Deuteronomic prayer of Solomon.[3] But he reinterprets this correspondence in a way that is reminiscent of, yet strikingly different from, the Deuteronomic "name" theology. In the Deuteronomic theology Yahweh places his *šēm* permanently in the temple as the earthly symbol of his eternal heavenly enthronement. For Ezekiel Yahweh manifests his presence and dominion on earth by means of his enthroned *kābôd* (Glory).[1] But he does not present Yahweh's Glory as only the earthly representation of his heavenly enthronement. Rather, his Glory is his awesome cosmic theophany presence itself enthroned in the temple, which casts fiery judgment upon both temple and city and then departs, throne and all, abandoning them to destruction (Ezek. 8-11). But the enthroned Glory also manifests itself temporarily among the exiles in Babylonia, coming in a storm theophany *min-haṣṣāpôn* (1:4). This perhaps alludes in a vague way to the cosmic dwelling place of Elyon on Mt. Zaphon as represented in the mythical fragment in Isaiah 14:12-15 and applied to Zion in Psalm 48:3 (Ezek. 1: 2-20; cf. 11:15-16).[2]

---

[1] See above, chap. 1, §§D,E,G, chap. 3, §C; cf. also H. G. May, "The Book of Ezekiel: Introduction and Exegesis," *IB*, VI (1956), 46-47, 69-75, 106, 114-117, 300-302, G. A. Cooke, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936), pp. 28-30, and Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 102-103.

[2] On Ezekiel's intellectual power and freedom as reflected in his novel use of traditional symbolic materials see von Rad, *Theology*, II, 221-223, 264, and J. Muilenburg, "Ezekiel," *PCB*, §495d.

[3] This cosmological typology is especially apparent both in the storm theophany element in the opening vision (1:4) and in the term *rāqîa*^{c} for the platform supporting the throne (1:22-26; 10:1).

After the judgment has taken place, the essence of Ezekiel's hope for the future is expressed in his vision of the glory returning to the new temple to dwell eternally in the midst of Israel (43:1-9; cf. 37:26-28; 44:1-4; 48:35).[3] The temple mountain will be elevated to cosmic heights (*har gābôah m^{e}’ōd*, 40:2; cf. 17:22-23), and will be the source of a life-giving river which will convert the land into a paradise (47:1-12).[4]

---

[1] Clements, *God and Temple*, pp. 104-107, has an excellent summary of Ezekiel's *kābôd* theology.

[2] See chap. 6, §B; cf. May, "Ezekiel," p. 70.

[3] Note the occurrence of terms traditionally associated with the theophany and enthronement symbolism of the ark and cherubim in the Solomonic temple such as *mālē’ k^{e}bôd-yhwh habbayit* (43:5; 44:4); *m^{e}qôm kis’î* and *m^{e}qôm kappôt raglay* (43:7); *’eškon-šām* (43:7) and *w^{e}šākantî b^{e}tôkām l^{ec}ôlām* (43:9). Cf. especially I Kgs. 8:6,9-13.

[4] On the association of the cosmic mountain of the gods with a cosmic river of paradise in Canaanite mythology as applied sometimes to Mt. Zion, see chap. 6, §§B,D; cf. May, "Ezekiel," p. 326.

Thus the distance and typological contrast between heaven and earth will be overcome. Yahweh's heavenly enthronement and his enthronement in the temple in the midst of Israel will become one and the same as indicated explicitly in the new name given to the city, *yhwh šāmmâ* (48:35).[1]

Neither Ezekiel nor any of the other exilic and early postexilic prophetic restoration literature advocates the idea of remaking the ark. The one and only explicit reference to the ark in this literature occurs in Jeremiah 3:14-18, which says pointedly and emphatically that when Yahweh brings the exiles back to Zion they shall not remake the ark nor even wish for it again (vss. 14b,16). Instead, Jerusalem itself shall be named "Yahweh's throne" (*yiqrᵉʼû lîrûšālēm kissēʼ yhwh*, vs. 17).[2] This resembles Ezekiel's restoration hopes, though lacking his cosmological imagery and speculations. It is perhaps even more in accord with the hopes of Deutero-Isaiah who, more than anyone else, was responsible for reviving the ancient Zion traditions and making them the primary vehicle for a creative theology of restoration with Zion as its central symbol.

---

[1] This name resembles and yet contrasts significantly with the Deuteronomic formula *lihyôt šᵉmî šām* (I Kgs. 8:16), *yihyeh šᵉmî šām* (II Kgs. 23:28), or the like, which stresses the contrast between heaven and earth; cf. above, §A. On the attempts of later Judaism, including the LXX, to avoid the bold implications of this name see Cooke, *Ezekiel*, pp. 538-539, 541.

[2] The authenticity, date, extent and unity of this pericope are all problematic as indicated by the diversity of opinion reflected in the commentaries. For a list of varying opinions see Hyatt, "Jeremiah," p. 827; cf. Bright, *Jeremiah*, p. 27. Hardly any commentary regards the entire passage as authentic. Some, however, claim authenticity for vss. 14-16 or 14-17a or even for vs. 16 alone with its mention of the ark. To this writer it seems apparent that the entire passage, including vs. 16, presupposes the exile and probably the latter part of the exile when various hopes and plans for the restoration of Zion were in the air. Its closest connection is with the so-called "book of comfort" in Jeremiah 30-31. Since the date and authenticity of the various pericopes in this collection are equally problematic one can only say that Jeremiah did utter at least some promises of restoration as discussed above, §C, which shade off without clear distinction into supplemental sayings and oracles stemming from Jeremiah traditionists during the exile who began to express hopes similar to those of Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah.

F. Summary

The period of Assyrian and then Babylonian domination witnessed a partial decline and disintegration of the traditional theological symbolism of Zion. In the older Zion theology reflected in the Psalms, Zion symbolized Yahweh's theophany presence and holy war protection as an existing cultic reality resting upon traditions associated with the ark and cherubim concerning Yahweh's election of Zion in the time of David and Solomon. Influenced by Canaanite-Jebusite Elyon mythology, the vertical typology in which Yahweh's cosmic dominion and enthronement was symbolized by his dwelling in Zion tended to point toward a changeless and eternal kind of security repeatedly celebrated and renewed in the cult.

Beginning with Isaiah, this theology was modified and reinterpreted in various ways under the impact of the successive military and political crises and disasters of the Assyrian and Babylonian periods. Zion's function as a symbol of Yahweh's kingship and holy war deliverance could have had little meaning during the long period of Assyrian suzerainty and paganism under Manasseh. The Deuteronomic reform, based primarily on north Israelite, non-Zion traditions, used the tradition of Yahweh's election of Zion to support cultic centralization. But the Deuteronomists reinterpreted the traditional vertical typology, focusing upon the throne symbolism of the ark and cherubim, in terms of the "name" theology. This emphasized Yahweh's transcendence and rejected Canaanite style mythological concepts associated with the theme of Yahweh's kingship at Zion. The prophets of this period, especially Micah and Jeremiah, contributed to the disintegration of Zion theology by turning both the traditional holy war symbolism of Zion and other traditional themes against Zion itself in oracles proclaiming its rejection and impending destruction by Yahweh. In contrast to Isaiah, they offered no corresponding hope of deliverance for Zion.

The destruction of Jerusalem followed by the exile shattered the last illusory remnants of the old theology of holy war protection and security. This is attested in Lamentations which views the disaster as an act of total rejection and holy war destruction directed by Yahweh himself against Zion and its divine throne symbolism. The book of Ezekiel also reveals indirectly that Zion had ceased to be a living symbol of Yahweh's holy war deliverance. Despite the intense concern of Ezekiel with Jerusalem and the temple, the name Zion and the divine title Yahweh Sabaoth are missing completely from the book. Nevertheless, he does formulate his hopes of restoration in terms of the theophany symbolism of the ark and temple. But it remained for others to revive the word Zion as a symbol of eschatological hope.

CHAPTER IX. THE DEVELOPMENT OF ZION AS AN ESCHATOLOGICAL SYMBOL

The prophetic oracles, sayings and poems preserved in the many strata of material in the book of Isaiah can be distributed chronologically over a period of as much as three hundred years or more. This indicates that the disciples of Isaiah formed a fairly well-defined circle of traditionists which maintained its identity for an equally long period of time, producing other prophets who reinterpreted and supplemented the Isaiah traditions to maintain their relevance for subsequent generations.[1] Zion was apparently an important theological symbol not only for Isaiah himself, but also for the Isaiah circle of traditionists throughout its history. This may be inferred from the fact that the word Zion occurs more frequently in the book of Isaiah than in any other Old Testament book and, even more, from the fact that it occurs as a theologically significant term in all the major strata of the book.[2] Starting from the analogy of Isaiah's alienation from Ahaz it seems likely that the circle of disciples and traditionists who succeeded him would have been similarly alienated from Manasseh and his paganizing innovations in connection with the temple cult.[1] If so, then it appears that reflection on the significance of Zion among the Isaiah traditionists was carried on apart from immediate participation in the temple cultus. Furthermore, the infrequent occurrence of the word Zion and the relative insignificance of Zion themes in the literature of the late seventh and early sixth centuries, together, indicate that Zion remained a living and creative theological symbol primarily among the Isaiah traditionists rather than in the temple cult itself. Deutero-Isaiah, more than anyone else, brought Zion back into the main stream of Jewish religious life as a major theological symbol. His influence is apparent in postexilic prophetic books such as Zechariah as well as the postexilic portions of Isaiah. Thus the primary remaining task is to investigate the theological significance of Zion in the post-Isaianic strata of the book of Isaiah, especially Deutero-Isaiah.

---

[1] On this essential corollary of the now widely accepted oral tradition approach to the Isaianic literature, see H. Birkeland, *Zum hebräischen Traditionswesen: Der Komposition der prophetischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Avhandlinger utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, II, Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1938, No. 1; Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1938), pp. 26-41, and S. Mowinckel, *Prophecy and Tradition: The Prophetic Books in the Light of the Study of the Growth and History of the Tradition* (Avhandlinger utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, II, Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1946, No. 3; Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1946), pp. 65-77; cf. Bentzen, *Introduction*, I, 102-108, II, 114, D. R. Jones, "Isaiah--II and III," *PCB*, §447, and Harrelson, *Interpreting the Old Testament*, pp. 226-228. Although the history of the Isaiah circle of traditionists cannot be traced except by inferences from the various strata of material in the book, its beginnings may be evident in the saying in Is. 8:16 MT in which Isaiah commits his testimony to his disciples. The key word *b^{e}limmûdāy* is sometimes regarded as textually doubtful since the LXX reads *tou mē mathein* (= *millamēd*, *BH*); cf. Gray, *Isaiah*, I, 155-156, and Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 227. But MT is supported by Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion; cf. J. Ziegler, ed., *Isaias* (Septuaginta, 14; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939), pp. 152-153. Note also Is. 50:4; 54:13.

[2] See chap. 3, §C, for statistics.

A. Zion as an Eschatological Symbol in Isaiah 2:2-4 and Micah 4:1-4

Whether the famous Zion passage in Isaiah 2:2-4, together with its duplicate in Micah 4:1-3(4), stems from Isaiah himself cannot be decided with confidence. Despite the seeming uniqueness of the passage, Wildberger has collected an impressive amount of evidence showing that its closest linguistic and conceptual contacts are with Isaiah and the Zion psalms.[1] Whether or not it stems from Isaiah himself, it is much more closely affiliated with his thought than with that of Micah. Micah 4:4 may, however, preserve the original ending of the oracle, as recognized by many interpreters. The presence of the same oracle in Micah, together with the occurrence of other promises concerning Zion in that book, may have resulted from the influence of Isaiah traditionists upon the Micah traditions.[2] If the passage is later than Isaiah it must nevertheless be regarded as a connecting link between Isaiah and Deutero-Isaiah rather than as a postexilic passage subsequent to Deutero-Isaiah.[3]

---

[1] See chap. 7, §§B-C, and the opening remarks in chap. 8.

Isaiah 2:2-4 resembles the messianic oracles in Isaiah 9:1-6 and 11:1-9 in mood and exalted style and in the hope it expresses. But Zion rather than the Davidic king is the focal point for the mediation of divine authority and universal peace. Just as they represent semi-eschatological prophetic oracles based on traditions of the kind found in the royal psalms, so the Zion prophecy is a similar semi-eschatological oracle based on traditions of the kind found in the Zion psalms.[4] All three passages envision a climactic but nevertheless historical divine act of salvation. In Isaiah 2:2-4 the eschatological character of the event is made more explicit by the introductory formula *b^{e}’aḥ^{a}rît hayyāmîm* (vs. 2).[1] Likewise, the goal is more explicitly universal.

---

[1] H. Wildberger, "Die Völkerwallfahrt zum Zion: Jes. II 1-5," *VT*, VII (1957), 62-72, and *Jesaja*, pp. 76-90.

[2] Cf. Birkeland, *Zum hebräischen Traditionswesen*, p. 73.

[3] In contrast to Deutero-Isaiah there is no hint of the exile in the passage nor of the return of the exiles to Zion. Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 180-181, regards it as later than the eighth century, but nevertheless as lacking any close parallels to postexilic eschatological prophecy. G. von Rad, "Die Stadt auf dem Berge" (1949), *GS*, pp. 214-217, and *Theology*, II, 294-295, seems to regard it as Isaianic or at least earlier than Deutero-Isaiah.

[4] Wildberger, "Die Völkerwallfahrt zum Zion," p. 68.

The cosmic elevation of Mt. Zion as *har-yhwh* (vs. 2, omitting *bêt* with the LXX), reflects vaguely the Canaanite cosmic mountain theme, as do Psalms 48:2; 78:69; and Ezekiel 40:2.[2] Here, however, it functions almost as an indirect theophany statement. As the place where Yahweh's *tôrâ* is mediated to all the nations, Mt. Zion becomes a new and greater Sinai (vs. 3). But more prominent than the possible analogy with Sinai is the picture of the universal pilgrimage to Zion (vss. 2-3), portrayed on the analogy of Israel's regular pilgrimages to Zion as exemplified especially in Psalm 122.[3] But the single purpose of their pilgrimage is to receive instruction from Yahweh, *w^{e}yôrēnû midd^{e}rākāyw* / *w^{e}nēl^{e}kâ b^{e}’ôr^{e}ḥôtāyw* (vs. 3). This instruction, further characterized as *tôrâ* and *d^{e}bar-yhwh* going forth from Zion (vs. 3) and also as Yahweh deciding disputes among the nations, *w^{e}šāpaṭ bên haggôyîm* / *w^{e}hôkîaḥ l^{ec}ammîm rabbîm* (vs. 4), is thought by Wildberger to refer to oracular instructions and decisions mediated by prophets such as Isaiah associated with the temple cult.[1] The traditional role of the Davidic king as dispenser of legal decisions at Zion may also be implied as in Psalm 122:5 and Isaiah 9:6; 11:3-4.[2] However, since no human mediator for the divine instruction and judgment is indicated in Isaiah 2:2-4, the picture may suggest more boldly that Yahweh's own cosmic theophany presence, enthroned as king at Zion, will dispense instructions and legal decisions to the nations in a direct and unmediated way.[3] But the picture is not clarified or elaborated.

---

[1] That this is not just a late formula is shown by its occurrence in Gen. 49:1 introducing the blessings of Jacob and in Num. 24:14 introducing the last Balaam oracle; cf. Gray, *Isaiah*, I, 44, and Wildberger, "Die Völkerwallfahrt zum Zion," pp. 72-73, and *Jesaja*, pp. 81-82.

[2] On the cosmic mountain theme see chap. 6, §§B,D, and chap. 8, §E; cf. Wildberger, *Jesaja*, pp. 82-83, Clements, *God and Temple*, p. 82, and Harrelson, *Interpreting the Old Testament*, p. 234.

[3] Note the similar pilgrimage formulas, *bêt yhwh nēlēk*, Ps. 122:1, and *l^{e}kû w^{e}na^{ca}leh ’el-har-yhwh ’el-bêt ’^{e}lōhê ya^{ca}qōb*, Is. 2:3 = Mic. 4:2; cf. Wildberger, "Die Völkerwallfahrt zum Zion," p. 74.

The poem moves on to its climax, the universal end of war and the establishment of harmonious security everywhere (Is. 2:4 [= Mic. 4:3] + Mic. 4:4). This universal acceptance of Yahweh's guidance occurs spontaneously, without any act of divine victory or power based on traditional holy war motifs of the kind so prominent in the Zion psalms.[4]

---

[1] Wildberger, "Die Völkerwallfahrt zum Zion," pp. 79-80, cites Is. 1:10; 5:24; 8:16; 30:9, and notes Isaiah's practice of addressing oracles to foreign nations, 14:28-32; 18:1-6; 19:1-15. For further parallels and analogies see Wildberger, *Jesaja*, pp. 84-86.

[2] The verbs *šāpaṭ* and *hôkîaḥ* (vs. 4) may point in this direction. In Ps. 122:5 one of the benefits or blessings of pilgrimage to Zion is the rendering of judgment (*mišpāṭ*) by the Davidic king; cf. II Sam. 15:2-6; I Kgs. 3:16-28; 7:7, and Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 840-841. The verbs *šāpaṭ* and *hôkîaḥ* occur twice in synonymous parallelism in Is. 11:3-4 with the divinely inspired Davidic king (vs. 2) as subject; cf. Wildberger, *Jesaja*, p. 86.

[3] Such a picture would reflect in greatly modified form the old mythological theme, associated with the ark at Zion, of Yahweh in the role of Elyon, the cosmological head of the pantheon, ruling the nations through subordinate divine beings as in Ps. 82 and Deut. 32:8-9; cf. chap. 4, §C. On the cosmic elevation of the temple mountain representing the overcoming of the distance between Yahweh's heavenly enthronement and its earthly typological counterpart in Ezekiel, see chap. 8, §E; cf. Fohrer, *Jesaja*, I, 48-49.

[4] Only the single half line, *nākôn yihyeh har-yhwh*, Is. 2:2, reflects

B. Zion as an Eschatological Symbol in Deutero-Isaiah

Deutero-Isaiah represents the last creative reinterpretation of Zion as a theological symbol in the Old Testament. The various themes of Deutero-Isaiah are so closely intertwined that it is difficult to isolate any one of them and discuss it without considering all the others at the same time.[1] So far as Zion is concerned there are two governing themes. One is the deliverance from exile pictured both as a new exodus and as a great festival pilgrimage to Zion. The other is the theophany manifestation of Yahweh's kingship and glory at Zion which will reveal his universal sovereignty to the nations. A third notable feature is the extensive personification of Zion = Jerusalem as Yahweh's chosen people referred to intimately or addressed directly by him in the feminine singular.

The opening poem of the collection, which has marks of a prophetic call account, shows the close juxtaposition of these themes (Is. 40:1-11).[2]

---

even vaguely the traditional function of Zion as a symbol of cosmological security and divine holy war protection; cf. Wildberger, "Die Völkerwallfahrt zum Zion," pp. 68-69, 73, Jesaja, p. 82, and Kaiser, Jesaja 1-12, pp. 22-23.

[1] Leaving the Servant Songs out of account, two of the most valuable summaries of the theology of Deutero-Isaiah are those given by J. Muilenburg, "The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 40-66: Introduction and Exegesis," IB, V (1956), 398-406, and von Rad, Theology, II, 238-250. Also helpful is C. R. North, The Second Isaiah: Introduction, Translation and Commentary to Chapters XL-LV (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 12-28.

[2] This passage is usually considered as a unit; cf. Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," pp. 422-424, North, Second Isaiah, p. 71, C. Westermann, Das Buch Jesaja: Kapitel 40-66 (ATD, 19; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), pp. 29-30, and Jones, "Isaiah--II and III," §448ab. However, as North indicates, one cannot be completely confident that the unity is original. G. Fohrer, Das Buch Jesaja, III: Kapitel 40-66 (ZB; Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1964), pp. 15-23, divides vss. 1-8 into

The plural form of the imperatives in Yahweh's opening speech (vss. 1-2a) indicates that the prophet overhears Yahweh commissioning his heavenly council to announce a message of comfort to his people (*^{c}ammî*), equated by synonymous parallelism with Jerusalem (vs. 2bc).[1] In effect this proclamation, intended without distinction for the nation in exile and for Zion, brings the exile to an end and initiates a new age of mercy and deliverance. The divine command for unnamed workmen to build Yahweh's processional way through the desert (vss. 3-4) prepares for a climactic theophany revelation of the *kābôd yhwh* to all mankind (vs. 5). This allusive language calls to mind the triumphal return of a king from war and perhaps the festival procession of Marduk at Babylon.[2] But, above all, it recalls the ceremonial procession of the ark and the associated theophany and holy war themes in the psalms of Yahweh's kingship, especially Psalm 24:7-10.[3]

---

three subunits, vss. 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and considers vss. 9-11 separate. The delimitation of the separate units or pericopes in Deutero-Isaiah is usually problematic as evident from the remarkable diversity and lack of consensus among scholars who have analyzed these chapters; cf. North, pp. 4-12. In general it is safer in considering the thought of Deutero-Isaiah to posit relatively short units such as those identified form-critically by J. Begrich, *Studien zu Deuterojesaja* (BWANT, IV:25; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938), pp. 5-60, rather than the long, artistically constructed theological poems discovered by Muilenburg. For purposes of the ensuing discussion the recent commentaries of Muilenburg, North, Fohrer and Westermann have been compared in order to arrive at a defensible division of the material into relatively short pericopes.

[1] Cf. Begrich, *Studien zu Deuterojesaja*, pp. 55, 154, Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," pp. 422-423, and Wright, *Isaiah*, pp. 96-97.

[2] See Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," pp. 426-427, North, *Second Isaiah*, pp. 75-76, and Westermann, *Jesaja 40-66*, pp. 34-35.

[3] See above, chap. 4, §G; cf. I Kgs. 8:1-13, discussed above, chap. 2, §D, and Pss. 29:1-2; 96:7-9; 98:1-3. Note also Cross, "The Divine Warrior," pp. 28-29.

In the closing lines of the poem (vss. 9-11) Zion personified is commissioned as the herald of Yahweh's triumphant coming.[1] In the imagery of the herald of victory ascending a high mountain, the cosmic eschatological exaltation of Mt. Zion may be implied as in Isaiah 2:2, and especially Ezekiel 17:22; 40:2.[2] The announcement of Yahweh's triumphant coming again reflects the theophany and holy war imagery traditionally associated with the processional entry of the ark (vs. 10).[3] But at the same time it reflects Yahweh's holy war triumph at the exodus.[4] Thus Deutero-Isaiah takes up and adapts the ancient Jerusalem tradition, reflected in Exodus 15:1b-18 and Psalm 78, which pictured the *Heilsgeschichte* as starting with Yahweh's deliverance of Israel from Egypt, continuing with his leading of Israel into the holy land, and climaxing with his choosing of Zion as his dwelling place.[5]

---

[1] In vs. 9 Zion and Jerusalem must be taken in apposition with *m^{e}baśśeret*, not as its object; cf. Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," pp. 431-432. When not in apposition with Zion the word is masculine, *m^{e}baśśēr*, in Deutero-Isaiah.

[2] On the verb *biśśar* referring to a herald bringing a message of victory in battle, see Ps. 68:12; I Sam. 31:9; II Sam. 1:20; 4:10; 18:19-20; I Chr. 10:9; cf. Fohrer, *Jesaja*, III, 22, and Begrich, *Studien zu Deuterojesaja*, pp. 52-53.

[3] On this cultic meaning of the verb *bô’*, see Pss. 24:7,9; 68:18; 96:13; 98:9; Deut. 33:2 as discussed above, chap. 4, §§A,F.

[4] To *b^{e}ḥōzeq* (vocalizing with IQIs^{a} and the versions rather than MT *b^{e}ḥāzāq*; cf. *BH*) compare the formula *b^{e}ḥōzeq yād hôṣî’ānû yhwh* and its variant, Ex. 13:3,14,16. To *z^{e}rô^{c}ô* referring to Yahweh's triumphant power, a figure used often by Deutero-Isaiah (48:14; 51:5,9; 52:10; 53:1), compare the related exodus victory formula *b^{e}yād h^{a}zāqâ ûbizrôa^{c} n^{e}ṭûyâ*, or the like, Deut. 4:34; 5:15; 7:19; 9:29; 11:2; 26:8; Ps. 136:12; cf. I Kgs. 8:42; II Kgs. 17:36; Jer. 21:5; 27:5; 32:17; Ezek. 20:33,34; Exod. 6:6; II Chr. 6:32.

[5] See chap. 4, §D, and chap. 5, §A. On the exodus tradition in

Essentially the same picture is presented in even more exultant language in 52:7-10, except that the herald (*m^{e}baśśēr*) is not Zion but rather a runner approaching Zion (vs. 7).[1] This passage closely resembles the psalms of Yahweh's kingship. The herald's climactic word of salvation to Zion is the enthronement formula *mālak ʾ^{e}lôhayik*, a slight variant of the enthronement formulas in Psalms 47:9; 93:1; 96:10; 97:1; 99:1.[2] However, in contrast to those passages, there is no clear allusion to the ark and no theophany description. Nevertheless, the climactic theophany approach of Yahweh is boldly indicated in the picture of the watchmen on the walls who *^{c}ayin b^{ec}ayin yir'û b^{e}šûb yhwh ṣiyyôn* (vs. 8b). This presents a theme similar to Ezekiel's vision of Yahweh's *kābôd* returning to the temple (Ezek. 43:1-9).[3] But, in contrast to Ezekiel, Deutero-Isaiah seems to have no more interest in the temple than in the ark. Instead, Zion as such is itself the focal point of Yahweh's victorious return.

This is illustrated in 52:1-2 which may have been closely connected with verses 7-10 before the intrusion of the prosaic addition in verses 3-6.[4] Expressions such as *^{c}uzzēk* in parallelism with *tip'artēk* (vs. 1), and the imperative *qûmî* (vs. 2), reminiscent of cultic language

---

Deutero-Isaiah, see B. W. Anderson, "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, pp. 177-195.

[1] On the close connection between 40:9-11 and 52:7-10, see Westermann, *Jesaja 40-66*, p. 202. Cf. Cross, "The Divine Warrior," pp. 29-30.

[2] See above, chap. 4, §§E-F.

[3] See above, chap. 8, §E.

[4] On the intrusive character of vss. 3-6 see Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," pp. 603, 608.

associated with the ark in older traditions, are here addressed to Zion as a woman in mourning, summoning her to remove her bonds and purify herself in preparation for Yahweh's advent.[1] In 52:9 the ruins themselves greet his coming with the cultic singing and shouting which in former times had acclaimed Yahweh's enthroned theophany presence in connection with the ark (vs. 9). But the theophany is neither concealed within the temple nor limited to Jerusalem. It is seen by the whole earth as a mighty and climactic act of deliverance (vs. 10).

After the opening poem, references to Jerusalem or Zion in the first half of Deutero-Isaiah (Is. 40-48) are relatively infrequent, but important in their contexts. In his lawsuit against the pagan gods in 41:21-29, Yahweh vindicates his sovereignty by pointing out that he alone announced ahead of time the victorious conquests of Cyrus by sending a herald (*m^ebaśśēr*) to Zion (vs. 27). The herald is unidentified but may refer to earlier prophecies of the fall of Babylon to the Medes, either by Deutero-Isaiah himself (cf. Is. 47) or by other anonymous exilic prophets (cf. Is. 13:2-22; 21:1-10; Jer. 50-51).[2] This theme is elaborated in the poem or collection of poems on the rise of Cyrus in 44:24-45:13.[3]

---

[1] On the association of the words *^{c}ōz*, *tip'eret*, and *qûmâ* with the ark see Davies, "Ark of the Covenant," p. 225, and Pss. 78:61; 132:8; cf. 89:18; 96:6. See above, chap. 1, §§A,C, chap. 4, §F, chap. 5, §A.

[2] On this point see Fohrer, *Jesaja*, III, 46-47. On the traditional background of this theme of Yahweh arousing an enemy against Babylon see Westermann, *Jesaja 40-66*, pp. 73-75.

[3] Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," p. 516, considers this passage as one poem. Westermann, *Jesaja 40-66*, pp. 125-126, considers 44:24-45:7 a single oracle with 45:8 and 45:9-13 as separate units. North, *Second Isaiah*, pp. 143-151, goes still further, considering 44:24-28 and 45:1-2 also as separate units. This is perhaps the safest procedure.

In the hymnic self-predications of Yahweh in 44:24-28 Yahweh's self-vindication over against the pagan gods takes place in the rebuilding of Jerusalem, which constitutes his chief purpose for Cyrus and confirms the words of his prophets (vs. 26). At the same time it is a climactic act of power comparable to his creation of the universe (vs. 24; cf. vs. 27).[1] In 45:7-12 the same correlation of creation and the arousing of Cyrus to free the exiles and rebuild Jerusalem (*^{c}îrî*) vindicates Yahweh against those who bring complaints against him, and perhaps against those who reject the words of Deutero-Isaiah concerning Cyrus.[2] The poem or collection of poems in Isaiah 46, contrasting Yahweh's universal sovereignty with the powerlessness of the gods of Babylonia, again climaxes with Yahweh's summoning of Cyrus to deliver Zion as the fulfillment of his sovereign purpose announced from the beginning (vss. 9-13).[3] Thus, for Deutero-Isaiah, the anticipated restoration of Zion through the rise of Cyrus constitutes the concrete historical content of Yahweh's self-revelation and self-glorification before the world and the climax of all his former acts.

The universal implications of this climactic event are indicated in the promise of 45:14, which pictures the peoples of Africa bringing tribute to Zion and acknowledging Yahweh, the God of Zion, as the one and only God.[1] The Isaianic circle of traditionists derived this idea from ancient Jerusalem traditions associated with the theme of Yahweh's kingship symbolized by the ark and cherubim, as indicated by the post-Isaianic supplement in Isaiah 18:7 to an oracle of Isaiah concerning Ethiopia and Egypt (18:1-6). The language of 18:7 is dependent on the tradition reflected in Psalms 68:30,32 and 76:12 which pictures the nations and kings of the earth, especially Egypt and Ethiopia, bringing tribute to the temple at Jerusalem in response to Yahweh's holy war power and theophany appearance symbolized by the ark.[2]

---

[1] On this passage see especially the comments of Westermann, *Jesaja 40-66*, pp. 126-128.

[2] Cf. North, *Second Isaiah*, p. 154, and Westermann, *Jesaja 40-66*, pp. 134-135.

[3] Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," pp. 535-536, and North, *Second Isaiah*, pp. 162-163, consider Isaiah 46 as a single poem. Westermann, *Jesaja 40-66*, pp. 143-151, and Fohrer, *Jesaja*, III, 97-103, divide it into a collection of several short poems. But, in contrast to Fohrer, Westermann is certainly right in treating at least vss. 9-13 as a unit standing in close relation to the whole chapter.

The second half of Deutero-Isaiah (Is. 49-55) has several extensive poems or collections of poems on the restoration of Zion which give further content, both symbolic and concrete, to the theophany picture of Yahweh's triumphant return to Zion in 52:7-10. These include 49:14-26; 51:1-52:12; 54:1-17. In 49:14-26, a long composite poem or collection of oracles (vss. 15-21,22-23,24-26), promises the return of the exiles and is addressed to Zion. In second person feminine form, these words of assurance and promise are Yahweh's answer to Zion's lament (vs. 14), reminiscent of the lament in Lamentations 5:22, that Yahweh has forgotten her.[1] There is less unity in 51:1-52:12, even though Zion or Jerusalem is mentioned frequently enough to constitute at least a weak connecting link between several of the units of material in this section (51:3,11, 16,17-23; 52:1-2,7-9).[2] Chapter 54 is more nearly a unity since the entire passage is addressed by Yahweh to Zion in second person feminine style as a series of reassurances and promises. However it may be treated as two separate poems, the first, 54:1-10, personifying Zion in intimate terms as Yahweh's estranged and restored wife, and the second, 54:11-17, describing the building and divine protection of the new Zion.[1]

---

[1] Some commentators revise the vocalization of the second person singular pronominal suffixes from MT feminine referring to Zion to masculine referring to Cyrus. But this is unjustified; cf. North, *Second Isaiah*, p. 157, and the IQIs^{a} feminine spellings *w'lyky* and *bky*. The extent of the unit introduced by this verse is very uncertain. Fohrer, *Jesaja*, III, 90-92, regards 45:14-17 as a distinct poem, whereas Westermann, *Jesaja 40-66*, pp. 137-139, divides even this into three separate fragments, vss. 14,15,16-17. In contrast, Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," pp. 528-529, and North, pp. 156-157, regard the entire section, 45:14-25, as a single poem.

[2] See above, chap. 4, §A, and chap. 6, §A. The key expression in Pss. 68:30 and 76:12 is *yôbîlû šay* which appears in passive form, *yûbal šay*, in Is. 18:7. Cf. *yôbîlûn minḥātî*, Zeph. 3:10, also referring to the bringing of tribute from Ethiopia.

---

[1] Despite the various thematic connections in Is. 49 the attempt of Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," pp. 564-565, to treat the entire chapter as a single poem is artificial as shown by the rearrangements he resorts to in order to unify the poem. It is safer to follow North, Second Isaiah, pp. 193-198, in treating vss. 14-21 and 22-26 as distinct units placed together because of similar thematic content. In fact, Fohrer, Jesaja, III, 130-133, may be right in regarding vss. 22-23 and 24-26 as also originally distinct. Such intentional juxtaposition of separate units with similar thematic content is also the best explanation of the thematic connections between vss. 14-26 and 7-13 preceding. Westermann, Jesaja 40-66, p. 117, regards vss. 14-26 as an intentional composition made up of the smaller units, vss. 14-20, 21-23, 24-26.

[2] This section illustrates well the difficulty of delimiting the separate pericopes in Deutero-Isaiah. Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," pp. 588-589, 602-603, finds two extensive poems here, 51:1-16 and 51:17-52; 12 (omitting 52:3-6 as a later prosaic insertion). Westermann, Jesaja 40-66, pp. 188-204, attempts a drastic series of rearrangements in the first part of 51 in order to obtain two fairly long poems (51:1a + 50: 10-11 + 51:4-7a + 1b + 7b-8; and 51:9-52:3) and some shorter poems and fragments (51:3; 52:4-6,7-10,11-12). In the light of these two contradictory attempts to discover longer poems it is safer to follow North, Second Isaiah, pp. 206-226, who distinguishes 51:1-8,9-11,12-16,17-23; 52:1-2[3-6],7-10,11-12, as separate units. Fohrer, Jesaja, III, 141-158, adopts the same divisions except that, rather strangely, he separates 51:11 from vss. 9-10 and puts it with vss. 12-16 which he regards as a later addition. In contrast to North and Fohrer, however, it is safer to treat 51:3 as a separate fragment since the unity of 51:1-8 is doubtful as demonstrated by Westermann's attempted rearrangements.

In these passages an integral part of the glorification of Zion is the return of the exiles, depicted in a variety of images. In the intimate language of 49:15-21 Zion is portrayed as a bereaved mother whom Yahweh addresses, giving an oathlike promise that her children are about to return unexpectedly to her in such numbers as to overpopulate the land. The same theme appears in 54:1-10 where Zion is pictured as Yahweh's estranged wife restored to everlasting favor in a covenant like that of Noah. In 49:22-23 the nations of the world and their rulers, at a signal from Yahweh, bring the exiles back to Zion and pay homage to her. This is perhaps an imaginative variation of the more traditional picture in 45:14 of the nations bringing tribute to Zion in response to Yahweh's self-revelation.[2] In the lament-like appeal and assurance in 51:9-11 the hoped-for return to Zion is presented as a re-enactment of the exodus from Egypt through the sea. This is depicted in terms of the Canaanite style myth of Yahweh's cosmic victory over the primeval chaos sea monster rahab = tannîn, an idea associated with the theme of Yahweh's holy war deliverance of the king or Zion in the Jerusalem cult tradition.[3]

---

[1] As usual Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," pp. 632-633, finds a single poem here, whereas Fohrer, Jesaja, III, 167-175, breaks the chapter into a series of small units, 54:1-3,4-6,7-8,9-10,11-17. Actually there is only one major break in the chapter, which justifies treating it as two distinct poems, vss. 1-10 and 11-17, following North, Second Isaiah, pp. 246-254, and Westermann, Jesaja 40-66, pp. 217-225.

[2] Note the comments of North, Second Isaiah, p. 196, on the essentially voluntary character of the action of the nations in 49:22-23.

[3] Especially Pss. 74:13-14 and 89:9-10; cf. 46:3-4; 93:1-4; Hab. 3:8-10. See above, chap. 4, §F, chap. 5, §E, chap. 6, §D; cf. Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," pp. 596-598, and North, Second Isaiah, pp. 211-212.

The return of the exiles and the glorification of Zion is also depicted in the mythological imagery of the desert marvellously transformed into a paradise-like garden. Zion itself will be transformed from a desolate waste into an Eden-like garden (*k^{ec}ēden, k^{e}gan-yhwh*) according to the poetic fragment in 51:3. The same will happen with the desert through which will pass the processional way for the new exodus deliverance (41:17-19; 43:16-21; 49:9-12; 55:12-13; cf. 44:3-4). This theme is presented most fully in Isaiah 35, which is closely dependent upon Deutero-Isaiah if not actually from him.[1] Here returning to Zion is almost equivalent to entering paradise. In these pictures Deutero-Isaiah is no doubt elaborating originally Canaanite paradise and mountain-of-god themes traditionally associated with Zion. The vaguely mythological titles bestowed upon Zion in Psalm 48:2-3 echo the fragmentary myths given in Isaiah 14:12-15 and Ezekiel 28:12-19.[2] It is also evident in the imagery of fructifying streams recalling Genesis 2:10-14 and Ezekiel 47:1-12 and echoed in Psalm 46:5.[3] But, in contrast to the picture of Eden in Ezekiel 28:13-14, Deutero-Isaiah completely omits the cosmic mountain theme in his Eden descriptions, though once, in Isaiah 54:11-12, he does picture the new Zion as built by divinely instructed builders using precious stones as in the Ezekiel passage.[4] Though drawing primarily upon garden-of-Eden imagery associated with Zion, Deutero-Isaiah also uses the theme of the fructifying stream to elaborate the tradition of Yahweh providing water in the desert at the time of the exodus from Egypt in Isaiah 48:20-21, which closely parallels Exodus 17:6; Numbers 20:11 and Deuteronomy 8:15.

---

[1] Note that 35:10 is a doublet of 51:11.

[2] See chap. 6, §B.

[3] See chap. 6, §D.

[4] Cf. North, *Second Isaiah*, pp. 251-252. In vs. 13 vocalize *w^{e}kol-bônayik*; cf. *BH*.

Deutero-Isaiah also promises that Yahweh will overthrow Zion's enemies and oppressors though, aside from 52:7-10, he does not use imagery directly reminiscent of the Zion holy war theophany tradition. In 54:11-17, following the picture of Zion as built with precious stones like Eden, the promise is given that any enemy who threatens will be defeated. Isaiah 49:24-26, an oracle of assurance, portrays the violent overthrow and self-destruction of Zion's oppressors (cf. Is. 47) as a direct act of deliverance by Yahweh in which "all flesh" will recognize him as Zion's champion. Here Deutero-Isaiah perhaps draws vaguely upon the ancient holy war traditions of Zion in the climactic divine title ʼ^{a}bîr ya^{ca}qōb (vs. 26).[1] In the climactic promise of the poem in 51:17-23, the devastation which has been meted out to Zion by her enemies will be meted out by Yahweh in turn to her enemies (vss. 22-23).

C. The Dependence of the Jerusalem Restoration Prophets on Deutero-Isaiah

The prophets associated with the restoration movements in Jerusalem at the beginning of the Persian period were strongly dependent upon Deutero-Isaiah. The major features of the new salvation events centering in Zion proclaimed by Deutero-Isaiah are portrayed in a more elaborate and systematic way in the three poems found in Isaiah 60-62. These poems must probably be placed in the earliest situation in Palestine just prior to or contemporary with Haggai and Zechariah.[1]

---

[1] Note the contexts in which this title occurs in Gen. 49:24 and Ps. 132:2,5; cf. ʼ^{a}bîr yiśrāēl, Is. 1:24, where the context also pictures Yahweh as an avenging warrior. The perhaps traditional formula in Is. 49:26b also occurs with slight variation in 60:16b.

At the beginning of Isaiah 60 the hymnlike summons to Zion to arise in preparation for Yahweh's theophany appearance over Zion (vss. 1-2) is vaguely reminiscent of cultic imagery formerly associated with the ark as in 52:1-2.[2] At the same time the theophany portrayal recalls the ancient holy war hymnic theophany tradition of Yahweh coming from Sinai but transforms it here into an analogy of the rising of the sun, *ûk^{e}bôd yhwh ^{c}ālayik zāraḥ* (vs. 1), *w^{e}^{c}ālayik yizraḥ yhwh* / *ûk^{e}bôdô ^{c}ālayik yērā'eh* (vs. 2).[3] But Yahweh's glory, which becomes Zion's perpetual light, so far transcends the brightness of the sun and moon that they cease to function (vss. 19-20). As in Deutero-Isaiah, the response to Yahweh's theophany is a great pilgrimage of the nations and their kings coming to Zion from all directions, bearing the exiles with them (vss. 3-4; cf.

---

[1] See Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, pp. 343-345, Weiser, *The Old Testament*, pp. 206-207, Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," pp. 697-698, Fohrer, *Jesaja*, III, 13, 226, 235, 240, Westermann, *Jesaja 40-66*, pp. 236-241, 280-281, and D. R. Jones, *Isaiah 56-66 and Joel* (TBC; London: SCM Press, 1964), pp. 19-21, 25-28, 65-66, 78, 81. However, the view of Westermann and Jones that Is. 56-66 is a unity deriving from the same situation cannot be safely adopted; cf. Eissfeldt and Weiser.

[2] Jones, *Isaiah 55-66 and Joel*, p. 66, also sees a reminiscence of the ark chants of Num. 10:35 and Ps. 132:8 in the imperative *qûmî* and of the processional entry of the ark in the theophany term *bā'* as in Pss. 24:7-10; 96:13; 98:9. See also *ûm^{e}qôm raglay '^{a}kabbēd*, vs. 13; cf. Ps. 132:7; I Chr. 28:2; Lam. 2:1; Ezek. 43:7.

[3] See Deut. 33:2, *yhwh missînay bā'* / *w^{e}zāraḥ miššē^{c}îr lāmô*, and Ps. 68:18, *yhwh bā' missînay* (emended); cf. chap. 4, §A. Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," pp. 697-699, also sees an allusion to the creation of light overcoming the primeval darkness as in Gen. 1:2-3. Westermann, *Jesaja 40-66*, p. 285, thinks the imagery is that of a rising star or constellation.

49:18,22-23). As in Isaiah 2:2-4, the great pilgrimage of the nations is a spontaneous response to Yahweh's self-revelation at Zion.[1] But here, rather than the cosmic elevation of Zion, it is the great light shining at Zion in contrast to the universal darkness covering the rest of the earth which prompts them to come. Though the traditional holy war connotations of Yahweh's theophany appearance are lacking, nevertheless the nations which formerly oppressed Zion will instead prostrate themselves before her (vs. 14).[2] Thus the primary focus of the poem is not on Yahweh, but on the glorification of Zion itself through the pilgrimage of the nations and through the great wealth they bring from the far corners of the earth for the building of Zion and the temple in unprecedented splendor (vss. 5-17).[3]

Similar themes occur in Isaiah 61 and 62 with even greater emphasis upon the privileged status of Zion, whose inhabitants will all be priests while foreigners do the work of farming (61:5-7). Zion's special status will also be symbolized by divinely given new names symbolizing in the imagery of marriage the dramatic transition from divine forsakenness to divine favor (62:2-5). Indeed, all three poems reflect a strong sense of contrast between an actually existing situation of hardship, discouragement and continuing divine absence on the one hand, and an intense and imminent expectation of the great theophany appearance of Yahweh which will initiate the marvellous restoration of Zion.[1]

---

[1] For a comparison of Is. 60 with 2:2-4 and Deutero-Isaiah, see von Rad, "Die Stadt auf dem Berge," pp. 218-221, and Theology, II, 294-296.

[2] Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," p. 703, and Westermann, Jesaja 40-66, p. 287, rightly regard vs. 12 as a prosaic gloss whose harsh connotations are out of harmony with the context.

[3] Cf. von Rad, "Die Stadt auf dem Berge," pp. 220.

This contrast is also apparent in Haggai, who counteracts the despair of the returnees by presenting a similar picture of the imminent pilgrimage of the nations and the flow of treasures and wealth from all over the world to the temple through a cosmic "shaking" of the world by Yahweh (Hag. 2:6-9).[2] But, in contrast to Isaiah 60-62, Haggai sees this as a universal holy war victory by Yahweh over the nations which will lead to the enthronement of Zerubbabel as Yahweh's chosen Davidic king (2:20-23).

Except for the distinctive form of his visions, Zechariah's oracles express ideas essentially similar to those of Haggai and Isaiah 60-62, also showing much dependence on Deutero-Isaiah.[3] The nations which oppressed Zion are about to be overthrown and Yahweh is again ready to show compassion to her after the time of wrath (Zech. 1:14-16; 2:1-4). Yahweh will once again dwell in Jerusalem (8:3) and his theophany presence will be the wall protecting Zion (2:8-9).[4] A great pilgrimage of exiles accompanied by the nations will come to Zion (2:10-16; 6:15; 8:1-8; 8:20-23). They will participate in building the temple (6:15), and the nations will become Yahweh's chosen people along with Israel (2:11).

---

[1] Cf. Westermann, Jesaja 40-66, p. 298.

[2] See von Rad, "Die Stadt auf dem Berge," pp. 221-223, Theology, II, 296, and Harrelson, Interpreting the Old Testament, pp. 387-389.

[3] See von Rad, Theology, II, 281-288.

[4] D. R. Jones, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi (TBC; London: SCM Press, 1962), p. 64, thinks this idea of a divine protective fire surrounding Zion resembles Is. 4:5.

Anonymous oracles in other prophetic books reflect similar dependence on Deutero-Isaiah, as for example Zephaniah 3:14-20 and Jeremiah 31:10-14; cf. Micah 4:6-8 and Zephaniah 3:9-13. Thus the early restoration period seems to have been dominated by Deutero-Isaiah's vision of the imminent return of Yahweh's glory to Zion and the resultant universal pilgrimage of the exiles and of the nations to Zion. Zion thus represented an anticipated but unrealized future unity of Israel and mankind, standing in sharp antithetical contrast to the present separation and disunity.

D. Exilic Survivals of the Zion Holy War Deliverance Tradition

In the passages discussed above holy war ideas are present but subordinate to the theme of the return. However, other sources indicate that for some individuals or groups during and after the exile the old holy war ideas associated with Zion formed the central basis of hope. This is evident in Psalms 74 and 79, both community laments which probably date from the exile.[1] Both focus on the desecration of Zion and the temple (74:3-7; 79:1-3). Psalm 74 uses traditional language referring to the holy war symbolism of the ark in the appeal for divine intervention, *qûmâ* (vs. 22), and perhaps in the word *b^{ec}uzz^{e}kā* (vs. 13) in the hymnic recital of the originally Canaanite myth of Yahweh's primeval victory over the chaos ocean monsters, *yām*, *tannînîm*, and *liwyātān* (vss. 13-14).[2]

---

[1] See Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 514-515, 550-551, for a summary of various views on the dating of these psalms and the arguments for an exilic dating of both.

[2] On the Ugaritic background of these mythological terms see chap. 6, §B; cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, I, 517-518.

Psalms 74 and 79 both place their entire hope in Yahweh's holy war intervention and vengeance against those who destroyed Zion and the temple. Psalm 137, with its poignant vow to remember Zion, shows a similar tendency among the exiles to find comfort in the hope of divine vengeance upon Edom and Babylon (vss. 7-9).[1]

Although much less prominent, such hopes for divine vengeance against the enemy are also expressed in Lamentations (1:21-22; 3:61-66; 4:21-22) with Edom mentioned specifically in 4:21-22.[2] Resembling Lamentations in mood is the communal lament over Zion in Isaiah 63:15-64:11 which probably dates from a time earlier than Deutero-Isaiah during the period of the exile.[3] A distinctive feature of this poem, however, is the appeal for Yahweh's intervention in 63:19b-64:2 in terms of the archaic holy war hymnic theophany tradition associated with Zion.[4]

63:19b *lû’-qāra*^{c}*tā* *šāmayim* *yāradtā* / *mipp*^{e}*neykā* *hārîm* *nāzōllû*[5]

. . . .

64:1b *l*^{e}*hôdîa*^{c} *šimkā* *l*^{e}*ṣāreykā* / *mippāneykā* *gôyîm* *yirgāzû*

---

[1] Cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, II, 907-908.

[2] Cf. Gottwald, *Lamentations*, pp. 88-89, 109.

[3] On this delimitation of the poem see Westermann, *Jesaja 40-66*, pp. 310-312. On this dating see Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," pp. 729-730, and Fohrer, *Jesaja*, III, 246-247, who both consider the hymnic recital in 63:7-14 as the introduction to the lament that follows; similarly Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, p. 345.

[4] See Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 14-15, 129-130, and Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," pp. 739-740; cf. Pss. 18:8-10; 46:7; 68:8-9; 99:1; 144:5; Ex. 15:14; Mic. 1:3-4.

[5] Or perhaps vocalize *nāzālû* with LXX and Vulg.; cf. *BH*, and Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," p. 739.

E. The Attack of the Nations and Yahweh's Eschatological Victory at Zion

There is another well-defined group of exilic and postexilic passages which elaborate in eschatological terms the traditional theme of Yahweh's holy war defense of Zion. In probable chronological sequence these are Micah 4:11-13; Ezekiel 38-39; Joel 4:9-17; Zechariah 12 and 14 (Deutero-Zechariah).[1]

Though often dated to postexilic times, Micah 4:11-13 contains no historical allusions that make such a date certain.[2] Like the Zion psalms it presents a brief and generalized picture of an attack by many nations against Zion (*w^{ec}attâ ne'espû ^{c}ālayik / gôyîm rabbîm*, vs. 11; cf. Pss. 46:7; 48:5; 76:4; Is. 17:12).[3] In this respect it forms a bridge between them and the Joel and Deutero-Zechariah passages. Micah 4:11-13 differs from the Zion psalms when it indicates that the attacking nations are unwittingly participating in Yahweh's plan to destroy them (vs. 12). Also in contrast to the Zion psalms, Yahweh does not destroy them by any kind of direct theophany intervention. Instead he summons and empowers

---

[1] For this grouping see von Rad, *Theology*, II, 293-294.

[2] For the common postexilic dating see R. E. Wolfe, "The Book of Micah: Introduction and Exegesis," *IB*, VI (1956), 927-929, Thomas, "Micah," §554a, J. Marsh, *Amos and Micah* (TBC; London: SCM Press, 1959), p. 111, and Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, p. 411. A pre-exilic date or even derivation from Micah himself is considered possible by Weiser, *Kleine Propheten*, I, 240-241, and *The Old Testament*, p. 254, and apparently by von Rad, *Theology*, II, 293. Robinson in Robinson and Horst, *Kleine Propheten*, p. 143, is on safest ground when he simply labels it "ein Auschnitt aus einem verhältnismässig alten apocalyptischen Gedicht," incorporated here by a redactor.

[3] Cf. Weiser, *Kleine Propheten*, I, 241-242.

Zion herself to destroy them (vs. 13). The opening word *qûmî* of this summons is reminiscent of the traditional imperative *qûmâ*, invoking the holy war intervention of Yahweh as symbolized by the ark.[1] The holy war imagery is further apparent in the closing *ḥērem* instruction, *w^{e}haḥ^{a}ramtî lyhwh biṣ^{c}ām / w^{e}hêlām la'^{a}dôn kol-hā'āreṣ* (vs. 13c).[2]

The Gog oracle in Ezekiel 38-39 resembles Micah 4:11-13 in several of its main features despite its almost grotesque elaboration and repetitiousness.[3] However the great attack is made on Israel as a whole. Jerusalem is never mentioned. Gog and a great horde of nations from the most distant parts of the earth come to attack,[4] unwittingly led on by Yahweh in order that he may destroy them (38:3-16; 39:2-6; cf. Micah 4:11-12). In contrast to Micah 4:11-13, Yahweh himself will defeat the invader (38:18-23; 39:3-6). But, as in the Micah passage, Israel will burn Gog's abandoned weapons in a seven-year-long *ḥērem*-like act and will bury the dead to purify the land (39:9-15; cf. Mic. 4:13). At the same time, in contrast to the Micah passage, Ezekiel 38-39 borrows elements from the day-of-Yahweh tradition such as cosmic disintegration (38:19-20) and especially the great sacrificial feast prepared by Yahweh (39:17-20).[1]

---

[1] Cf. Num. 10:35; Pss. 68:2; 132:8; Is. 52:2, as discussed in chap. 1, §A, chap. 4, §A, chap. 5, §A, and chap. 9, §B. Note also that the infrequent divine title *'^{a}dôn kol-hā'āreṣ* of Mic. 4:13c occurs as a title associated with the ark in Josh. 3:11,13 and at the climax of a theophany passage in Ps. 97:5 celebrating Yahweh's kingship; cf. chap. 4, §D.

[2] Read the verb at the beginning of the line as second feminine singular with the versions; cf. *BH*. The spelling is an archaism which need not be emended.

[3] These chapters are commonly regarded as somewhat later than Ezekiel, so Cook, *Ezekiel*, pp. 407-408, May, "Ezekiel," pp. 62, 273, Harrelson, *Interpreting the Old Testament*, p. 313, and S. B. Frost, *Old Testament Apocalyptic: Its Origin and Growth* (London: Epworth Press, 1952), p. 88. On the other hand, Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, p. 380, and Muilenburg, "Ezekiel," §514c, think that a nucleus of material goes back to Ezekiel.

[4] The traditional background and even the identity of many of the names is uncertain. However, the account elaborates the prophetic theme of the foe from the north as found especially in Jer. 4-6 (cf. Ezek. 38:17; 39:8) and perhaps also Canaanite mythological themes associated with Mt. Zaphon (cf. *yark^{e}tê ṣāpôn*, Ezek. 38:6,15; 39:2; Is. 14:13 and Ps. 48:3). See May, "Ezekiel," p. 273, A. S. Kapelrud, *Joel Studies* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1948:4; Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1948), pp. 103-104; cf. Frost, *Old Testament Apocalyptic*, pp. 88-90.

In combining the theme of the day of Yahweh with that of the attacking horde of nations, Ezekiel 38-39 forms a connecting link to the book of Joel, which has Zion as its focus of attention. Joel shows much dependence on older prophetic books and traditions and may be dated in the postexilic period, perhaps as late as the fourth century.[1] After the initial lament over the locust plague, the author interprets the plague as a portent of the approaching day of Yahweh, depicted as a universal catastrophe threatening Israel (1:15; 2:1-2; cf. Zeph. 1:14-16; Is. 13:6; Ezek. 30:3).[2] The locusts become a great marauding army (2:3-9). Battle imagery merges into a picture of cosmic disintegration including the darkening of the heavenly bodies, a typical day-of-Yahweh theme (2:10-11; cf. Is. 13:10,13; 34:4; Ezek. 38:19-20).

---

[1] Day-of-Yahweh themes are directed as threats against Israel in Am. 5:18-20; Is. 2:9-22; against Judah and Jerusalem in Zeph. 1:7-18; Ezek. 7; and against foreign nations in Is. 13; 34; Jer. 46:3-12; Ezek. 30:2c-9. On the basis of these and other related passages von Rad, "The Origin of the Concept of ~~the~~ Day of Yahweh," and *Theology*, II, 119-125, has shown that the day-of-Yahweh theme represented a well-defined and distinctive set of concepts, probably deriving from Israel's ancient holy war traditions. For other recent summary discussions of the day of Yahweh see Jeremias, *Theophanie*, pp. 97-100, who lists all occurrences of the term *yôm yhwh* and its variants, E. Jenni, "Day of the Lord," *IDB*, I, 784-785, H. W. Wolff, *Dodekapropheten: Joel* (BKAT, 14:5; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1963), pp. 38-39, and Wildberger, *Jesaja*, pp. 105-106. For the theory that the day of Yahweh originally referred to the day of his theophany manifestation in the New Year festival see Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, pp. 132-133, 141-143, 145. Views of this kind have been effectively refuted by Robinson, *Inspiration and Revelation*, pp. 140-143, who concludes that before Amos the term "denoted an extraordinary manifestation of Yahweh's activity on Israel's behalf, and in particular the victory of Israel in battle." Since only Is. 34:8 interprets its desolations as vengeance on behalf of Zion, the day-of-Yahweh tradition probably had no inherent connection with the traditional theme of Yahweh's holy war defense of Zion.

The series of promises in the second half of the book (2:18-4:21), answering the laments and acts of penance in the first half, forms an excellent counterpart to the locust plague and day-of-Yahweh themes of the lament.[3] Yahweh promises to destroy the invading horde, called *haṣṣ^{e}pônî* in 2:21, probably recalling the semimythical theme of the foe from the north.[1] On the day of Yahweh the legendary ^{c}*ēmeq* *y*^{e}*hôšāpaṭ* (4:2,12) or ^{c}*ēmeq* *heḥārûṣ* (4:14), apparently conceived as adjacent to Jerusalem, will be the place of divine judgment and holy war vengeance upon the nations summoned together by Yahweh (4:9-15). But Mt. Zion will be the place of deliverance for Israel from the cosmic collapse (3:3-5; 4:16; cf. Ob. 17; Am. 1:2). Thus Zion, which was in the Zion psalms and Isaiah the symbol of Yahweh's holy war deliverance and protection, becomes now the symbol of security in the face of great eschatological catastrophes.[2] Traditional mythological imagery of Zion as the Eden-like holy mountain of Yahweh with the fructifying stream flowing from the temple enhances the picture, contrasting with the eternal desolation of Edom and Egypt (4:17-21; cf. Ps. 46:5; Ezek. 47:1-12). Like the literature of the sixth century anticipating the return from exile, so also the book of Joel reveals an intense contrast between the present and an anticipated but unrealized future. To this is added a second contrast. Zion is at the same time the symbol of eschatological deliverance and of eschatological catastrophe, both depicted in semimythical terms.[3]

---

[1] On Joel's dependence on older prophetic books see Wolff, *Joel*, pp. 10-11. There is no consensus on a more precise date. Wolff, pp. 2-4, argues for the early fourth century; similarly J. A. Thompson, "The Book of Joel: Introduction and Exegesis," *IB*, VI (1956), 732, L. H. Brockington, "Joel," *PCB*, §538b, Weiser, *Kleine Propheten*, I, 90, and W. Neil, "Joel, Book of," *IDB*, III, 928. Robinson in Robinson and Horst, *Kleine Propheten*, pp. 55-56, places it as late as the third century. Jones, *Isaiah 56-66 and Joel*, pp. 135-138, proposes a date around the year 500. Still earlier dates are proposed by Harrelson, *Interpreting the Old Testament*, p. 335, who suggests the early exile, and Kapelrud, *Joel Studies*, pp. 191-192, who suggests a time around the year 600. Such early dates have gained little acceptance.

[2] Cf. von Rad, *Theology*, II, 121-122, and Wolff, *Joel*, pp. 12-14, 25-27, 38-40, 45-46, 50-52, 55-56.

[3] Despite the apparent looseness of structure and the quotations from older prophetic books, recent scholarship has moved away from theories of multiple authorship or extensive interpolations toward seeing the book as a unity deriving, at least via oral tradition, from one prophet. See for example Kapelrud, *Joel Studies*, pp. 3-9, 176-180, Wolff, *Joel*, pp. 5-12, and Brockington, "Joel," §538d.

The anonymous and probably late collections of material in Zechariah 9:14 (Deutero-Zechariah) contain three separate eschatological promises concerning Yahweh's holy war deliverance of Zion, 9:11-17 in poetic form, and 12:1-9 and 14:1-19 in prose.[4] The first of these, 9:11-17, is the only one using the word Zion rather than Jerusalem. Otherwise it has little that is distinctive. It pictures Yahweh summoning the exiles and reuniting Judah and Ephraim as sons of Zion into a holy war weapon against Greece (vss. 11-13).[1] Then Yahweh himself intervenes in a great holy war theophany imitative of the pre-exilic holy war theophany tradition (vs. 14; cf. Jud. 5:4; Hab. 3:3). But here it is connected with the day-of-Yahweh theme of Yahweh's sacrificial meal (vs. 15; cf. Ezek. 39:17-20).[2]

---

[1] See Kapelrud, *Joel Studies*, pp. 93-108, and Wolff, *Joel*, pp. 10, 73-74.

[2] Cf. Wolff, *Joel*, pp. 81, 98. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 14-17.

[4] Though no consensus exists, the most common dating of these chapters is in the early Greek period. See the discussions of Weiser, *The*

The second passage, Zechariah 12:1-9, likewise mixes diverse traditions. It resembles Micah 4:11 in picturing all the nations of the earth attacking Jerusalem (vs. 3). But, as in the ancient holy war tradition, Yahweh strikes the chariot armies with panic (vs. 4). Judah then conquers the nations round about and the Davidic king receives godlike power in an eschatological renewal of the Davidic empire (vss. 3-8).

In comparison to these two passages, Zechariah 14 is a more elaborate though disjointed proto-apocalyptic composition comparable to

---

Old Testament, pp. 273-275, Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 435-440, and R. C. Dentan, "The Book of Zechariah, Chapters 9-14: Introduction and Exegesis," IB, VI (1956), 1089-1091. The delimitation of separate units is also quite uncertain. On 9:11-17 which is only a loosely knit unit see Elliger, Kleine Propheten, II, 141-144, and Horst in Robinson and Horst, Kleine Propheten, pp. 248-249. The whole section 12:1-13:6 is often taken as a unit even though containing diverse themes. But, since there is no internal thematic connection between 9:1-12 and what follows, it is better to consider them separate with Harrelson, Interpreting the Old Testament, p. 400. The closing verses, 14:20-21, look like an afterthought.

[1] The reference to Greece in vs. 13 is often deleted for metrical reasons as a gloss; cf. BH, P. R. Ackroyd, "Zechariah," PCB, §570e, and Jones, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, pp. 136-137. But see Dentan, "Zechariah 9-14," p. 1097, who rejects this deletion.

[2] See Elliger, Kleine Propheten, II, 142.

Ezekiel 38-39. Like the book of Joel, this passage unites the themes of the day of Yahweh (yôm-bāʼ lyhwh, vs. 1), and the great attack of the nations upon Jerusalem (vs. 2). Yahweh himself gathers them to the attack (cf. Mic. 4:12; Ezek. 38:3-9; 39:2). His victory over them is accompanied by cataclysmic transformations of the landscape (vss. 3-5,10-11). Jerusalem is left in an elevated position and streams of water flow perpetually to the eastern and western seas (vss. 10,8). This paradise scene is enhanced by the perpetual absence of winter and night (vss. 6-7). Accompanied by his heavenly court, Yahweh himself comes and reigns over the earth (vss. 5,9). The climax is the initiation of a great annual pilgrimage to Jerusalem on the feast of Tabernacles, which all nations must observe under threat of divine affliction and punishment (vss. 16-19).

The passages in Zechariah 9-14 illustrate the great intermingling of ancient themes characteristic of apocalyptic writing, here represented in its preliminary stages. The loosely organized materials resist any attempt to impose a unifying theme or pattern upon them. Thus, in the later postexilic period, Zion almost ceases to function in a clearly articulated and distinctive way as a unifying theological symbol despite its continuing cultural and political significance as the cultic center of Judaism. Even the word Zion itself ceases to be associated with a characteristic set of themes as in the Zion psalms, Isaiah and Deutero-Isaiah.

F. Zion as a Proto-Apocalyptic Symbol in the Latest Strata of the Book of Isaiah

More clearly than anywhere else among the later postexilic supplements in the prophetic books, Zion retains some significance as a unifying theological symbol in the liturgy-like compositions in Isaiah 24-27 and 33, the latest strata of the book of Isaiah.[1]

Isaiah 33, which has few proto-apocalyptic features, may be considered first. After a woe saying and a brief lament concerning an unnamed attacker (vss. 1-2), an answering prophetic promise envisions, but does not describe, a theophany intervention on behalf of Zion by echoing traditional language of the Isaianic and Zion traditions (vss. 3-6).[2] Following a second lament (vss. 7-9), an oracle promises a theophany intervention against the enemy (vss. 10-12), using language recalling one of the Zion psalms (Ps. 46:11, *'ārûm*). But the theophany threat is then turned against sinners within Zion, still using language reminiscent of the holy war defeat of the enemy in another Zion psalm (vss. 13-14a, *'āḥ^{a}zâ* *r^{ec}ādâ*; cf. Ps. 48:7). But this then merges into an entrance liturgy (vss. 14b-16) reminiscent of Psalms 15 and 24:3-6. Using the imagery of the paradise-like river, the last major section of the chapter pictures Zion in quietness and security against all enemies under the kingship of Yahweh (vss. 17-24; cf. Pss. 46:5; 48:8; Ezek. 47:1-12; Joel 4:18; Zech. 14:8).[1] Thus Isaiah 33 revives traditional Zion holy war themes, directing them against clearly human but unspecified enemies, both without and within Zion. Yet, despite its lack of historical specificity, it cannot fairly be called an apocalyptic style composition.

---

[1] Older attempts to date these passages in terms of historical allusions have largely been abandoned. The same is true of attempts to date them as late as the Maccabean period. But the majority of scholars still date them relatively late in the postexilic period; cf. Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, pp. 323-327, Weiser, *The Old Testament*, pp. 192-193, Bright, "Isaiah--I," §438a, 444c, Fohrer, *Jesaja*, II, 1-3, 129, 133, Frost, *Old Testament Apocalyptic*, p. 143. Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," p. 348, retains a Maccabean date for Is. 33, though he labels Is. 24-27 simply as "later postexilic," p. 297. On the other hand, Harrelson, *Interpreting the Old Testament*, pp. 245-246, has recently offered a rather unusual suggestion that these passages stem from disciples of Isaiah in Judah during the exile. But this hardly accounts for their proto-apocalyptic features. If approximation to apocalyptic style and themes can be used as a criterion, Is. 24-27 must be later than 33.

[2] To vs. 3 compare Is. 13:4; 17:12; 29:5-8; 30:31; 66:6; Pss. 48:5-7; 68:12. To vs. 6 compare Pss. 68:19; 93:4. Cf. Fohrer, *Jesaja*, II, 130.

In comparison to this, Isaiah 24-27, which also has many marks of dependence on Isaianic and Deutero-Isaianic traditions, is proto-apocalyptic in character and forms a major bridge leading from these traditions toward later full-fledged apocalyptic writings.[2] Though possibly intended as a more or less unified liturgy-like composition, the internal organization and structure of these chapters is quite loosely knit and appears to be made up of a series of more or less independent smaller units.[3] Thus the passages referring explicitly to Zion and/or Jerusalem (24:23; 27:13) or "this mountain" (bāhār hazzeh, 25:6,10) must be considered primarily as distinct, immediate contextual units, 24:21-23; 25:6-8,9-12; 27:12-13.[4]

---

[1] See Fohrer, Jesaja, II, 137. It is not clear whether melek, vs. 17, refers to Yahweh as in vs. 22, or to the restored Davidic dynasty.

[2] See especially Frost, Old Testament Apocalyptic, pp. 143-163. Whether these chapters were an intentional pseudograph on Isaiah as Frost claims need not be decided here.

[3] On the over-all composition of this section which alternates between eschatological prophecies and psalms, see Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 297-298, Fohrer, Jesaja, II, 1-3, Bright, "Isaiah--I," §438a, and Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 323-325.

[4] The precise extent of the individual pericopes is difficult to determine. Procksch, Jesaia I, p. 313, and Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 301-302, consider 24:18c-23 a unit. But the most clearly defined immediate context is vss. 21-23; cf. Frost, Old Testament Apocalyptic, p. 150,

Isaiah 24:21-23 adopts the day-of-Yahweh theme (*bayyôm hahû'*, vs. 21) of the disappearance of the heavenly bodies and the defeat of the nations to depict a climactic divine victory over a universal cosmic rebellion involving both the heavenly bodies, here mythologically personified, *yipqōd yhwh ^{c}al-ṣ^{e}bā' hammārôm bammārôm* (vs. 21; cf. *w^{e}hāp^{e}râ hall^{e}bānâ ûbôšâ haḥammâ*, vs. 23), and the kings of the earth, *w^{ec}al-malkē hā'^{a}dāmâ ^{c}al-ha'^{a}dāmâ* (vs. 21). The picture of these rebellious powers being imprisoned temporarily in the underworld, *w^{e}'uss^{e}pû '^{a}sēpâ 'assîr ^{c}al-bôr w^{e}sugg^{e}rû ^{c}al-masgēr* (vs. 22), appears to derive from the ancient Canaanite astral mythological theme, preserved in Isaiah 14:12-15 and Ezekiel 28:11-19, of Elyon casting down into the underworld the subordinate deity who tries to usurp his throne on the cosmic world mountain.[1] As victor, Yahweh reigns on Mt. Zion, his theophany presence outshining the sun and moon (vs. 23; cf. Is. 60:1-3,19-20). This verse draws upon the psalms celebrating Yahweh's kingship and upon the Deutero-Isaianic tradition in the triumphant words *mālak yhwh ṣ^{e}bā'ôt* (cf. Pss. 47:9; 93:1; 96:10; 97:1; 99:1; Is. 52:7). By implication, Zion is equated with the cosmic world mountain where Yahweh's enthroned glory displaces the heavenly bodies.

Bright, "Isaiah--I," §438f, and Fohrer, *Jesaja*, II, 12-15, who regard 24:21-25:12 as a prophetic liturgy. Procksch, pp. 318-322, considers 25:6-10a a unit with vss. 10b-12 a later addition; similarly Scott, pp. 304-305. But again the most immediate contextual unit is vss. 6-8, leaving vss. 9-12 as another less clearly unified piece; cf. Frost, pp. 150-151, 158, Bright, §638h-j, and Fohrer, pp. 18-22. The closing verses of the whole composition, 27:12-13, are perhaps two distinct climactic oracles intentionally paired with one another; cf. Bright, §439i. They were possibly connected originally with vss. 1-6; cf. Fohrer, p. 33.

[1] See above, chap. 6, §B; cf. Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 301-302, Fohrer, *Jesaja*, II, 14-15, and Frost, *Old Testament Apocalyptic*, p. 150.

Drawing again upon the day-of-Yahweh tradition, Isaiah 25:6-8 depicts a great banquet prepared for the nations by Yahweh on Mt. Zion, *bāhār hazzeh* (vs. 6).[1] The picture of Yahweh swallowing death, *billa^{c} hammāwet* (vs. 8), and putting an end to sorrow, may reflect vaguely the Canaanite style myth of the slaying of Mot, especially since the related myth of the slaying of the chaos sea monster is used explicitly in 27:1.[2] In a sudden shift, the next section, 25:9-12, contrasts Yahweh's protection of Zion, *kî-tānûaḥ yad-yhwh bāhār hazzeh* (vs. 10), with his humiliation and defeat of Moab, again a traditional theme (cf. Is. 15-16; Jer. 48; Ezek. 25:8-11).

Although Zion is not referred to explicitly elsewhere, the passages already discussed, together with the two closing oracles of 27:12-13, make Zion in effect the focal point of the whole eschatological drama implicit in Isaiah 24-27. Nevertheless, despite the various cataclysmic scenes, the ultimate climax is the Deutero-Isaianic theme of the return of the exiles to Zion, which here takes place in response, not to a direct theophany appearance, but rather to the blast of a great trumpet, *yittāqa^{c} b^{e}šôpār gādôl* (27:13). This may, however, reflect indirectly an ancient cultic theophany theme originally associated with the Sinai tradition

---

[1] On this element of the day-of-Yahweh tradition see the discussion above on Zeph. 1:7; Is. 34:5-7; Jer. 46:10; Ezek. 39:17-20; cf. Ezek. 32:4-6. For the importance of this theme in later apocalyptic thought see Frost, *Old Testament Apocalyptic*, pp. 152-153.

[2] On the slaying of Mot see *UM*, 49:II:4-37; 49:VI:10-34, translated in *ANET*, pp. 140, 141; cf. *UM*, ^{c}nt:III:41. On the slaying of the chaos dragon see *UM*, 67:I:1-3; ^{c}nt:III:35-41, translated in *ANET*, pp. 137, 138; cf. Pss. 74:13-14; 89:10-11; Is. 51:9. See Scott, "Isaiah 1-39," pp. 304, 311, and Frost, *Old Testament Apocalyptic*, p. 154.

(cf. Ex. 19:13,16,19; 20:18).[1] Thus, as in Deutero-Isaiah, Joel and Deutero-Zechariah, Zion is still the symbol of a set of climactic eschatological events of judgment and salvation introducing a new age in which Yahweh's kingship is fully effective. Despite the mythical, cosmological transformations depicted in connection with these events, Zion represents a continuing historical existence for Israel. As the center of pilgrimage, Zion symbolizes the unity of Israel which is to be made effective, not only as a transcendent cosmic and mythical reality, but also as a historical reality.

Zion continued to play an important role in the full-fledged apocalyptic writings of later Judaism and early Christianity. However, this constitutes another stage in its history as a theological symbol worthy of an extensive study in its own right rather than as a postscript to this study of Zion as a theological symbol in the Old Testament.[2]

G. Summary

Zion seems to have survived as a living and creative theological symbol primarily among the disciples and traditionists of Isaiah who probably were alienated from the temple cult in the time of Manasseh and who maintained their identity for several hundred years. Beginning already in the eighth century, the prophetic movement had begun to move Yahwism beyond its traditional basis in the recollection and cultic renewal of the saving acts of the past toward the expectation of analogous new divine acts.[1] An important example of this tendency is the vision, coming from the Isaianic circle, of the cosmic elevation of Zion and the pilgrimage of the nations to receive divine adjudication of their conflicts (Is. 2:2-4 = Mic. 2:1-3 + 4).

---

[1] On the trumpet in the Sinai theophany tradition see Beyerlin, *Sinaitic Traditions*, pp. 35-36, 135-136, 163.

[2] On the differences between prophecy and apocalyptic see von Rad, *Theology*, II, 301-308. For the significance of Zion in later Jewish and Christian apocalyptic literature see A. Causse, "Le mythe de la nouvelle Jérusalem du Deutéro-Esaie à la III^{e} Sibylle," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*, XVIII (1938), 396-416, K. L. Schmidt, "Jerusalem als Urbild und Abbild," *Eranos-Jahrbuch*, XVIII (1950), 207-248, and E. Lohse, "*Siōn, Ierousalēm, Hierosolyma, Hierosolymitēs*," §§B-D, *TWNT*, VII (1964), 324-325, 335-338. For surveys of Jewish apocalyptic thought see P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1934), Frost, *Old Testament Apocalyptic*, pp. 164-258, H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of*

This tendency came to a climax in the restoration hopes of Deutero-Isaiah. The hopes of Ezekiel, who never uses the word Zion, were formulated primarily on the basis of the theophany symbolism of the ark and temple. Those of Deutero-Isaiah center upon Zion itself, drawing upon the Isaianic traditions and the Zion themes of the psalms. In fact, Deutero-Isaiah drew upon all of Israel's sacred traditions, including originally Canaanite mythological themes. Using especially themes associated with the temple cult and with Zion, he anticipated a new divine act whose central feature is the marvellous glorification of Zion through the return of Yahweh's theophany presence. The new was marked off from the old by the time of Yahweh's judgment which was about to end. For Ezekiel the symbolic focal point of the new was the temple and its cult. But for Deutero-Isaiah it was Zion itself, which was to be both the goal of the great new exodus pilgrimage of the returning exiles and, at the

---

Apocalyptic (2d ed., London: Lutterworth Press, 1947), and in brief, M. Rist, "Apocalypticism," IDB, I, 157-161.

[1] See von Rad, Theology, II, 99-125, 181-187, 271-272.

same time, the symbol for Israel as Yahweh's covenant people. Thus Zion was no longer the symbol for an existing cultic reality but rather for an imminent eschatological hope and expectation.[1] The old vertical typology fell into the background and was replaced by a historical or eschatological typology in which the symbolic dimensions were temporal rather than spatial.[2] But this did not mean a cyclical Urzeit-Endzeit typology. Rather the new events were to transcend the old events. Yahweh's glory and theophany presence, about to be revealed at Zion, was to be the ultimate divine presence itself, which would bring about historical consequences of unprecedented and universal significance.

With Deutero-Isaiah the transformation of Zion as a theological symbol which took place between the crisis times of Isaiah and the postexilic restoration period was nearly completed. His vision of the imminent divine glorification of Zion and the resulting universal pilgrimage dominated the early postexilic restoration movement, as reflected in Isaiah 60-62, Haggai and Zechariah. But these hopes remained unfulfilled, though capable of repeated renewal through the assimilation of other traditional themes. During the exile the Zion theme of Yahweh's holy war intervention also remained alive as a hope of vengeance against the destroyers of Zion (Pss. 74; 79; Is. 63:15-64:11). This theme was later mythologically enhanced and universalized by assimilating day-of-Yahweh themes, as seen especially in Joel and Zechariah 14. Thus Zion became, at the same time, the symbol of impending eschatological catastrophe and divine judgment and of ultimate divine deliverance and triumph, both on a cosmological as well as a historical level.

---

[1] Cf. Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, pp. 116-117.

[2] Anderson, "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah," pp. 185-195. Interestingly enough the Priestly Document and the Chronicler, which do not present explicit prophetic-type eschatologies, do present the most explicit statements of a vertical typology found anywhere in the Old Testament in their interpretations of the tabernacle and temple respectively. Both are constructed according to a divinely transmitted heavenly tabnît (Ex. 25:9,40; I Chr. 28:11-12,18-19); cf. C. T. Fritsch, "TO ANTITUPON," Studia Biblica et Semitica Theodoro Christiano Vriezen Dedicata, pp. 101, 103. This may be regarded as a theological restatement of the old traditional symbolism of Zion and the Solomonic temple cult as reflected especially in the psalms of Yahweh's kingship; cf. chap. 4.

In Isaiah 24-27, the latest stage in the development of the Isaianic tradition, these themes were synthesized more fully with other Zion themes. Mythologically enhanced with a variety of cosmological themes, Zion became the focus of a whole complex of eschatological events of judgment and salvation. Yet it remained above all the symbol of a new historical existence imminent in the future. In brief, the whole exilic and postexilic development of Zion as a theological symbol continued to use cosmic mythological themes implying a vertical typology. But these served primarily to enhance its meaning as a symbol pointing to the future in terms of historical or eschatological typologies.

CONCLUSION

In the historical study of religions a creative tension must exist between two kinds of investigation. One approach looks for similarities and connections between different religions. The other looks for the unique or distinctive internal developments which mark different religions off from one another. In the special field of Old Testament some investigations aim primarily at discovering similarities and links between Israelite religious phenomena and the general religious milieu of the ancient Near East. Other investigations look for distinctive and creative developments within the Israelite religious faith. Both approaches are valuable though in tension with one another. This study has followed a developmental rather than a comparative approach. Taking the word Zion as the primary clue, it has attempted to show how the topographical, communal and cultic entity to which that word referred developed into a major theological symbol in the Israelite religious faith.

The unifying hypothesis has been that the major themes associated with Zion can best be understood as developments of themes associated with the ark at the beginning of the monarchy. Through the ark the Yahwistic cult, established at Zion by David, was in cultic continuity with Shiloh. This, rather than any pre-Davidic Jerusalem cult tradition, gave Zion its standing as an Israelite cult place and its original symbolic significance. Three themes associated with the ark at the beginning of the monarchy were of special importance for the meaning of Zion. The ark was a traditional cultic symbol mediating Yahweh's holy war action on behalf of Israel. The cherubim and the title Yahweh Sabaoth associated with the ark represented Yahweh's holy war intervention in storm theophany imagery of partially Canaanite background. But, at the same time, the ark was the symbol of Yahweh guiding Israel from Sinai into the land of Canaan in a series of holy war victories. Thus, through the presence of the ark and cherubim, Yahweh's choice of Zion became the climactic goal of the traditional Heilsgeschichte. At the same time Zion became the focal point of Yahweh's theophany action and holy war power.

Two other themes without precedent in the Shiloh cult tradition entered into the symbolism of Zion at this point. As one new theme, Zion and the ark cult developed imperial connotations in connection with the political and military triumphs of the Davidic dynasty. The bringing of the ark to Zion celebrated David's victories over the Philistines and the Jebusites. As David's foreign empire grew the ark cult also came to represent the holy war power of Yahweh bestowing universal dominion upon David from Zion. By the end of David's reign Zion had already become so closely identified with the triumphant symbolism of the ark cult that the topographical reference of the word changed as a result of the transferral of the ark from the City of David on the southeast hill to the Solomonic temple in the new imperial building complex on the northeast hill. Zion originally referred to the fortified Jebusite town on the southeast hill which was renamed City of David, whereas Jerusalem referred more broadly to the town plus the adjacent area dependent upon it. Later, as the term which came to be preferred in cultic poetry, Zion became topographically indistinguishable from Jerusalem. But its primary connotation became religious and symbolic through association with the holy war, theophany and imperial symbolism of the Yahwistic ark cult of the temple and with the Davidic dynasty as the chosen instrument of divine rule.

A second major theme entered into the symbolism of the ark cult after its establishment at Zion, probably as a corollary development simultaneous with the development of the imperial and dynastic symbolism. Canaanite El Elyon mythological themes appropriated from the Jebusites were used to glorify Yahweh in cosmological terms as creator of heaven and earth. He came to be pictured as the high god, enthroned above the world in cosmic splendor, as king over a pantheon of gods reduced to the status of a heavenly court of nameless subordinate semidivine beings. The ark and cherubim in the temple at Zion became the symbol of Yahweh's cosmic power and dominion. Thus a vertical typology arose in which Zion as Yahweh's holy mountain was the earthly counterpart or symbolic representation of his heavenly enthronement as Elyon. As such, Zion became the symbol of cosmic stability upheld by Yahweh over against threatening possibilities of cosmic collapse pictured in vaguely mythological terms as the rebellious uproar of the chaos waters. But this cosmological imagery, deriving ultimately from Canaanite conflict mythology, was used primarily to enhance the significance of Zion as the symbolic focal point of Yahweh's holy war theophany power acting on behalf of the Davidic king and providing security for Israel as Yahweh's people in the face of possible enemy attack. Thus the imagery of cosmic stability served primarily to depict Zion as a symbol of historical stability and permanence over against threatening possibilities of chaotic historical change and catastrophe.

Thus, during the early period of the monarchy, Zion became a full-fledged theological symbol pointing toward a particular understanding of Israel's existence in relation to God. As the goal of the *Heilsgeschichte*, Zion represented Israel's existence as the culmination or fulfillment of a series of victorious divine acts. As the earthly counterpart of an eternal divine realm, Zion pointed toward Israel's existence as a static order maintained by Yahweh and celebrated in the cult. Thus, Zion symbolized an existence which had come into being through a historical process, but which had reached an unchanging state in that no further development was expected. Yet this stability was not automatic in the sense of a dogma of inviolability. Instead, Zion represented a stability threatened by insecurity. It was a symbol evoking hope and trust in the possibility of divine acts of deliverance in the face of chaotic and unpredictable possibilities of disaster. Thus, Zion as a symbol dealt in a distinctive way with what Eliade has called "the terror of history."[1] It did not represent a myth of eternal return and renewal nor an *Urzeit-Endzeit* myth in which men may seek refuge in the face of contingency and change. Neither did it represent an automatic progression toward an ideal future. Instead, it pointed to the possibility of trust in God in the sense of facing and accepting the contingency and unknownness of the future with hope rather than despair.

In the light of the political and military upheavals associated with Assyrian imperialistic expansion in the eighth century, Isaiah reinterpreted the traditional symbolism of Zion in radical ways. Yahweh's holy war theophany power and cosmic dominion, which had represented security for Israel, were transformed into threats of wrath directed against Israel from Zion. Thus Yahweh's symbolic enthronement at Zion no longer represented enduring cosmic stability threatened by external chaotic forces. Instead, for Isaiah it represented Yahweh himself as the source of historical catastrophe for Israel. Isaiah rejected as futile every political, military or religious strategy intended to maintain historical stability by human power or wit. Thus the threat of divine judgment issuing from Zion represented the inescapableness of the terror of history which could not be evaded by any human device. The inability of Ahaz to accept the radical implications of Isaiah's interpretation of the Zion and dynastic traditions may have contributed to his turn away from Yahwism.

---

[1] Eliade, *Cosmos and History*, pp. 141-162.

Yet, instead of despair, Isaiah advocated radical trust in divine deliverance based on the promises implied in the traditional holy war theophany symbolism of Zion. Correlated with this was the demand that all other kinds of trust be abandoned. Thus he encouraged both king and nation to face and accept the terror and risk of history with openness and quiet assurance. Anxiety as a manifestation of distrust brought catastrophe. Yet trust did not in itself produce security. Rather Yahweh, whose sovereignty over the world was symbolized by Zion, retained his freedom and man's existence remained contingent. Thus, for Isaiah, Zion as the symbol of Yahweh's promises of deliverance represented Yahweh's unchangeable trustworthiness and power. As a kerygmatic symbol Zion invited Israel to rest its confidence in him in the face of the chaotic instability and terror of historical existence which neither Israel in its anxiety nor Assyria in its arrogant and self-deifying power could overcome.

The political and religious upheavals of the last century of the Judean monarchy brought about a partial disintegration of the traditional meaning of Zion as a symbol of security. The Deuteronomic reinterpretation of the traditional Zion vertical typology in terms of the "name" theology emphasized the contingency of Israel's historical existence in contrast to the permanence of Yahweh's sovereignty. Prophets such as Micah and Jeremiah proclaimed Yahweh's destruction of Zion as a symbol of false and illusory security. They rejected all hopes of deliverance based on the traditional Zion theology. The book of Lamentations accepted this as the inner meaning of the destruction of Zion. Yahweh himself destroyed Zion in order to destroy all false illusions of automatic security and divine protection. Thus the fall of Zion became, in Lamentations, the prime symbol of the terror of history, indicating that stability and permanence could not become a secure possession for Israel.

Zion as a symbol of hope remained alive primarily among the Isaianic school of traditionists, who were perhaps separated from direct participation in the temple cultus during the pagan reaction of Manasseh's reign and who maintained their identity for several centuries. The oracle in Isaiah 2:2-4 = Micah 4:1-4, and the promises of Deutero-Isaiah and Isaiah 60-62, all envisioned a new divine act centering at Zion which would bring universal acknowledgement of Yahweh by the nations of the world. In this new act Yahweh would overcome the distance between man and God implied in the old vertical typology. In Isaiah 2:2-4 = Micah 4:1-4 Zion is to be elevated to cosmic proportions as Yahweh's holy mountain. Deutero-Isaiah and Isaiah 60-62 expect Yahweh himself to come to Zion in the fullness of his glory, power and kingship, visible to all mankind. In both cases Yahweh is to become totally accessible and present with man at Zion. The response is to be a universal pilgrimage of the nations to Zion in order to receive from Yahweh the paradise-like blessings of peace, security and order. In Deutero-Isaiah the manifestation of Yahweh at Zion is to be the climactic event of the deliverance of Israel from exile in Babylon, pictured as a typological analogy of the ancient *Heilsgeschichte*.

But, in Isaiah 60-62, Haggai and Zechariah, as well as in Deutero-Isaiah, the imminent act of salvation was a hope and promise. It contrasted sharply with the actual situation of insecurity and divine absence symbolized by the humiliated and ruined state of Zion and the temple and the separation of the exiles from Zion. Thus, in the face of the terror and tragedy of history which Israel had experienced, Zion with its ancient traditions became a symbol of hope that the chaos and disorder of history, which man could not transcend, might be overcome from the side of God. The old vertical typology was replaced by an eschatological typology which enabled Israel to endure in hope the despair and futility of the existing historical situation of the exile and its aftermath.

In later postexilic prophecy Zion again appeared as an important theological symbol in Deutero-Zechariah, Joel and Isaiah 24-27 and 33. A new element was added to the eschatological symbolism of Zion with the assimilation of themes from the day-of-Yahweh tradition. The eschatological events were to include an attack upon Zion by a horde of enemies and a great cosmological collapse. But the enemy was to be destroyed in a universal holy war victory by Yahweh and chaos was to be overcome. As in the Deutero-Isaianic eschatology, Yahweh's theophany presence was to become totally present and accessible at Zion and his sovereignty fully evident. Zion would become a paradise-like mountain with streams flowing forth from its midst.

In this complex eschatology of both disaster and salvation Zion became a symbol of the openness of a future which held possibilities of both terrifying disaster and ultimate divine triumph and blessing. Thus the terror of history and the contingency of human existence could be faced with a hope which no catastrophe could destroy. But this differed from the old Canaanite-style vertical typology in avoiding the possible illusion that some kind of ultimate security and stability had already been given in Israel's existing cultic and political order. It also avoided the illusion of an automatic progression or return to an ideal order. Yet Zion, as an eschatological symbol, pointed away from despair in the face of the terror and uncertainty of history by affirming that no possible disaster is ultimate. Instead, it pointed toward trust in God who triumphs over disaster and gives hope beyond. Despite the mythical paradise-like imagery used to portray Zion as a symbol of eschatological hope, this hope did not become otherworldly or nonhistorical in character. The Zion of the future would be the place of pilgrimage to which Israel, scattered in exile over the world, would come. Thus Zion became a symbol of the unity of Israel which could not be destroyed by political disaster or by spatial separation from Zion.

The subsequent history of Zion as a symbol in Judaism cannot be explored here. Nevertheless, Zion as an eschatological symbol must be part of the basis for the survival of Judaism to the present as a self-conscious cultural community of faith despite historical catastrophes of a magnitude which ought to have destroyed it completely. This must also be the starting point for understanding how Jerusalem came to be a sacred city and a focal point of eschatological symbolism for Christianity and Islam.[1]

---

[1] See the opening remarks of the Introduction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources and Linguistic Aids

Aistleitner, J., *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache*, ed. O. Eissfeldt (Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historisch Klasse, Band 106, Heft 3), 3. Aufl., Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1967.

Brown, F., Driver, S. R., and Briggs, C. A., *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*, London: Oxford University Press, 1907.

Buhl, F., *Wilhelm Gesenius' hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*, 17. Aufl., Berlin/Göttingen/Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1915.

Burrows, M., ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, Vol. I: *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary*, New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950.

Colunga, A., and Turrado, L., eds., *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Clementinam*, Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1953.

Donner, H., and Röllig, W., *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, 3 Bde., Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1962-1964.

Driver, G. R., *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Old Testament Studies, No. 3), Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956.

Fitzmyer, J. A., *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1: A Commentary* (Biblica et Orientalia, No. 18), Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966.

Gordon, C. H., *Ugaritic Manual* (Analecta Orientalia, No. 35), 3 vols., rev. ed., Roma: Pontificum Institutum Biblicum, 1955.

Kautzsch, E., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 2d English ed. rev., tr. A. E. Cowley, London: Oxford University Press, 1910.

Kittel, R., ed., *Biblia Hebraica*, 7th ed. by A. Alt and O. Eissfeldt, Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1951.

Koehler, L., and Baumgartner, W., *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1951.

Liddell, H. G., and Scott, R., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. by H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie, London: Oxford University Press, 1940.

Mandelkern, S., *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae*, 2 vols., reprinted, Graz: Akademische Druk- und Verlagsanstalt, 1955.

May, H. G., and Metzger, B. M., eds., *The Oxford Annotated Bible*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Pritchard, J. B., ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 2d ed., Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1955.

Rahlfs, A., ed., *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX Interpretes*, 2 Bde., Stuttgart: Priviligierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.

Rawlinson, G., tr., "The History of Herodotus," *Great Books of the Western World*, ed. R. M. Hutchins, Vol. VI, Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1952, pp. 1-341.

Skehan, P. W., "A Fragment of the 'Song of Moses' (Deuteronomy 32) from Qumrân," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 136 (1954), pp. 12-15.

SPR TWRH NBY'YM WKTWBYM, New York: Hebrew Publishing Co., n.d.

Swete, H. B., ed., *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*, 3 vols., 2d ed., Cambridge: The University Press, 1895-1899.

Young, G. D., *Concordance of Ugaritic* (Analecta Orientalia, No. 36), Roma: Pontificum Institutum Biblicum, 1956.

Ziegler, J., ed., *Isaias* (Septuaginta, Vol. 14), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939.

B. Secondary Sources

Ackroyd, P. R., "Zechariah," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962, pp. 646-655.

Ahlström, G. W., "Der Prophet Nathan und der Tempelbau," *Vetus Testamentum*, XI (1961), 113-127.

Albright, W. F., *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, 4th ed., Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1956.

Albright, W. F., *The Archaeology of Palestine*, rev. ed., Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1960.

Albright, W. F., "Baal Zaphon," *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. W. Baumgartner *et al.*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1950, pp. 1-14.

Albright, W. F., "The Biblical Period," *The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion*, ed. L. Finkelstein, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949, as reprinted separately, Pittsburgh, 1955.

Albright, W. F., "A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems (Psalm LXVIII)," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXIII (1950-51), 1-39.

Albright, W. F., *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 2d ed., Garden City, N. Y.; Doubleday & Company, 1957.

Albright, W. F., "The Psalm of Habakkuk," *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy: Presented to Professor Theodore H. Robinson*, ed. H. H. Rowley, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950, pp. 1-18.

Albright, W. F., "Some Remarks on the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy xxxii," *Vetus Testamentum*, IX (1959), 339-346.

Albright, W. F., "What Were the Cherubim?" (1938), *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, ed. D. N. Freedman and G. E. Wright, Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1961, pp. 95-97.

Alt, A., "Gedanken über das Königtum Jahwes" (1945), *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Bd. I, 2. Aufl., München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959, pp. 345-357.

Alt, A., *Der Gott der Väter* (1929), reprinted in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Bd. I, 2. Aufl., München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959, pp. 1-78.

Alt, A., "Das Grossreich Davids" (1950), *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Bd. II, 2. Aufl., München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959, pp. 66-75.

Alt, A., "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums" (1953), *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Bd. II, 2. Aufl., München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959, pp. 250-275.

Alt, A., "Jerusalems Aufsteig" (1925), *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Bd. III, München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959, pp. 243-257.

Alt, A., "Micha 2:1-5, *GĒS ANADASMOS* in Juda" (1955), *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Bd. III, München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959, pp. 373-381.

Alt, A., "Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina" (1930), *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Bd. II, 2. Aufl., München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959, pp. 1-65.

Alt, A., "Der Stadtstaat Samaria" (1954), *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Bd. III, München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959, pp. 258-302.

Alt, A., "Das Taltor von Jerusalem" (1928), *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Bd. III, München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959, pp. 326-347.

Alt, A., *Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts* (1934), reprinted in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Bd. I, 2. Aufl., München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959, pp. 278-332.

Anderson, B. W., "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962, pp. 177-195.

Anderson, B. W., "Hosts, Host of Heaven," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, II (1962), 654-656.

Anderson, G. W., *A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament*, London: Gerald Duckworth & Company, 1959.

Anderson, G. W., "Hebrew Religion," *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. H. H. Rowley, London: Oxford University Press, 1951, pp. 283-310.

Anderson, G. W., "The Psalms," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962, pp. 409-443.

Anderson, R. T., "Was Isaiah a Scribe?" *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXIX (1960), 57-58.

Arnold, W. R., *Ephod and Ark* (Harvard Theological Studies, No. 3), Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917.

Barrois, G. A., "David, City of," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, I (1962), 782.

Barrois, G. A., "Shaveh, Valley of," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, IV (1962), 310.

Barrois, G. A., "Siloam," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, IV (1962), 352-355.

Barrois, G. A., "Topheth," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, IV (1962), 673.

Barrois, G. A., "Zion," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, IV (1962), 959-960.

Begrich, J., *Studien zu Deuterojesaja* (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, IV. Folge, Heft 25), Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938.

Bentzen, A., "The Cultic Use of the Story of the Ark in Samuel," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXVII (1948), 37-53.

Bentzen, A., *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 2 vols., 2d ed., Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1952.

Bentzen, A., *King and Messiah*, London: Lutterworth Press, 1955.

Beyerlin, W., *Die Kulttraditionen Israels in der Verkündigung des Propheten Micha* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Bd. 72), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959.

Beyerlin, W., *Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions*, tr. S. Rudman, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.

Bietenhard, H., "*onoma, onomazō, eponomazō, pseudōnymas*," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, V, ed. G. Friedrich (1954), 242-283.

Birkeland, H., *Zum hebräischen Traditionswesen: Der Komposition der prophetischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Avhandlinger utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, II, Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1938, No. 1), Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1938.

Blank, S. H., *Prophetic Faith in Isaiah*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958.

Bright, J., "The Book of Joshua: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, Vol. II, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953, pp. 539-673.

Bright, J., *A History of Israel*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

Bright, J., "Isaiah--I," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962, pp. 489-515.

Bright, J., *Jeremiah: Introduction, Translation and Notes* (The Anchor Bible, Vol. 21), Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1965.

Brockington, L. H., "Joel," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962, pp. 614-616.

Buber, M., *The Prophetic Faith*, tr. C. Witton-Davies, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960.

Burrows, E., "The Name of Jerusalem," *The Gospel of the Infancy and Other Biblical Essays*, ed. E. F. Sutcliffe (The Bellarmine Series, Vol. 6), London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1941, pp. 118-123.

Burrows, M., "Jerusalem," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, II (1962), 843-866.

Caird, G. B., "The First and Second Books of Samuel: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, Vol. II, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953, pp. 853-1176.

Cassirer, E., *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, Vol. II: *Mythical Thought*, tr. R. Manheim, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955.

Causse, A., "Le mythe de la nouvelle Jérusalem du Deutéro-Esaie à la III^{e} Sibylle," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*, XVIII (1938), 396-416.

Childs, B. S., "The Enemy from the North and the Chaos Tradition," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXVIII (1959), pp. 187-198.

Childs, B. S., *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis* (Studies in Biblical Theology, Second Series, No. 3), Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1967.

Childs, B. S., *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament* (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 27), Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1960.

Clements, R. E., *God and Temple: The Idea of the Divine Presence in Ancient Israel*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.

Clements, R. E., *Prophecy and Covenant* (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 43), London: SCM Press, 1965.

Cohen, S., "Ephrathah," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, II (1962), 122.

Cooke, G. A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (The International Critical Commentary), Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936.

Corney, R. W., "Abiathar," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, I (1962), 6-7.

Corney, R. W., "Abimelech," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, I (1962), 9-10.

Corney, R. W., "Ahitub," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, I (1962), 71.

Corney, R. W., "Eli," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, II (1962), 85.

Corney, R. W., "Hiram," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, II (1962), 606-607.

Cross, F. M. Jr., "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations*, ed., A. Altmann (Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies, Brandeis University, Texts and Studies, Vol. 3), Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966, pp. 11-30.

Cross, F. M. Jr., "Notes on a Canaanite Psalm in the Old Testament," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 117 (1950), pp. 19-21.

Cross, F. M. Jr., "The Priestly Tabernacle" (1947), *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, ed. D. N. Freedman and G. E. Wright, Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1961, pp. 201-228.

Cross, F. M. Jr., "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *Harvard Theological Review*, LV (1962), 225-259.

Cross, F. M. Jr., and Freedman, D. N., "The Blessing of Moses," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXVII (1948), 191-210.

Cross, F. M. Jr., and Freedman, D. N., "A Royal Psalm of Thanksgiving: II Samuel 22 = Psalm 18," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXII (1953), 15-34.

Cross, F. M. Jr., and Freedman, D. N., "The Song of Miriam," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, XIV (1955), 237-250.

Dahood, M., *Psalms 1-50: Introduction, Translation and Notes* (The Anchor Bible, Vol. 16), Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1966.

Davies, G. H., "The Ark in the Psalms," *Promise and Fulfilment: Essays Presented to Professor S. H. Hooke*, ed. F. F. Bruce, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963, pp. 51-61.

Davies, G. H., "Ark of the Covenant," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, I (1962), 222-226.

Davies, G. H., "Deuteronomy," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962, pp. 269-284.

Davies, G. H., "Ephod (Object)," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, II (1962), 118-119.

Davies, G. H., "Tabernacle," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, IV (1962), 498-506.

Davies, G. H., "The Yahwistic Tradition in the Eighth-Century Prophets," *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy: Presented to Professor Theodore H. Robinson*, ed. H. H. Rowley, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950, pp. 37-51.

Dentan, R. C., "The Book of Zechariah, Chapters 9-14: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, Vol. VI, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956, pp. 1089-1114.

Dentan, R. C., "Wars of the Lord, Book of the," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, IV (1962), 805.

De Vries, S. J., "Chronology of the Old Testament," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, I (1962), 580-599.

Dibelius, M., *Die Lade Jahves: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Bd. 7), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1906.

Donner, H., *Israel unter den Völkern: Die Stellung der klassischen Propheten des 8. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. zur Aussenpolitik der Könige von Israel und Juda* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, Vol. 11), Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964.

Driver, S. R., *Notes on the Hebrew Text and Topography of the Books of Samuel*, 2d ed., London: Oxford University Press, 1913.

Dus, J., "Der Brauch der Ladewanderung im alten Israel," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, XVII (1961), 1-16.

Eichrodt, W., *Der Heilige in Israel: Jesaja 1-12* (Die Botschaft des Alten Testaments, Bd. 17), Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1960.

Eichrodt, W., *Theology of the Old Testament*, tr. J. A. Baker, 2 vols., Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961-1967.

Eissfeldt, O., "El und Jahwe" (1956), *Kleine Schriften*, ed. R. Sellheim and F. Maass, Bd. III, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966, pp. 386-397.

Eissfeldt, O., "Jahwe Zebaoth" (1958), *Kleine Schriften*, ed. R. Sellheim and F. Maass, Bd. III, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966, pp. 103-123.

Eissfeldt, O., *Das Lied Moses Deuteronomium xxxii, 1-43, und das Lehrgedict Asaphs Psalm 78 samt einen Analyse den Umgebung des Mose-Liedes* (Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Sachs. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Phil.-histor, Klasse, 104/5), Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958.

Eissfeldt, O., *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, tr. P. R. Ackroyd, New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Eissfeldt, O., "The Prophetic Literature," *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. H. H. Rowley, London: Oxford University Press, 1951, pp. 115-161.

Eissfeldt, O., "Psalm 76" (1957), *Kleine Schriften*, ed. R. Sellheim and F. Maass, Bd. III, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966, pp. 448-457.

Eissfeldt, O., "Psalm 80" (1953), *Kleine Schriften*, ed. R. Sellheim and F. Maass, Bd. III, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966, pp. 221-232.

Eissfeldt, O., "Psalm 132" (1959), *Kleine Schriften*, ed. R. Sellheim and F. Maas, Bd. III, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966, pp. 481-485.

Eissfeldt, O., "Silo und Jerusalem" (1957), *Kleine Schriften*, ed. R. Sellheim and F. Maass, Bd. III, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966, pp. 417-425.

Eissfeldt, O., "Die Umrahmung des Mose-Liedes Dtn 32:1-43 und des Mose-Gesetzes Dtn 1-30 in Dtn 31:9-32,47" (1954-55), *Kleine Schriften*, ed. R. Sellheim and F. Maass, Bd. III, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966, pp. 322-334.

Eissfeldt, O. "Zur Deutung von Motiven auf den 1937 gefundenen phönizischen Elfenbeinarbeiten von Megiddo" (1950), *Kleine Schriften*, ed. R. Sellheim and F. Maass, Bd. III, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966, pp. 85-93.

Eliade, M., *Cosmos and History: The Myth of the Eternal Return*, tr. W. R. Trask, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.

Eliade, M., *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, tr. R. Sheed, Cleveland: The World Publishing Co., 1963.

Eliade, M., *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*, tr. W. R. Trask, New York: Harper & Row, 1961.

Elliger, K., *Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten*, II: *Die Propheten Nahum, Habakuk, Zephanja, Haggai, Sacharja, Maleachi* (Das Alte Testament Deutsch, Bd. 25), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1950.

Fohrer, G., *Das Buch Jesaja*, Bd. I: *Kapitel 1-23* (Zürcher Bibelkommentare), 2. Aufl., Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1966.

Fohrer, G., *Das Buch Jesaja*, Bd. II: *Kapitel 24-39* (Zürcher Bibelkommentare), Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1962.

Fohrer, G., *Das Buch Jesaja*, Bd. III: *Kapitel 40-66* (Zürcher Bibelkommentare), Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1964.

Fohrer, G., "*Siōn, Ierousalēm, Hierosolyma, Hierosolymitēs*," §A. "Zion-Jerusalem im Alten Testament," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, VII, ed. G. Friedrich (1964), 292-318.

de Fraine, J., "La royauté de Yahvé dans de textes concernant l'arche," *Volume du Congrès Geneve 1965* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, Vol. 15), Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966, pp. 134-149.

Freedman, D. N., "Pentateuch," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, III (1962), 711-727.

Fretheim, T. E., *The Cultic Use of the Ark of the Covenant in the Monarchial Period*, Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1967.

Fretheim, T. E., "Psalm 132: A Form-Critical Study," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXVI (1967), 289-300.

Fritsch, C. T., *The Book of Genesis* (The Layman's Bible Commentary, Vol. 2), Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959.

Fritsch, C. T., "*TO ANTITUPON*," *Studia Biblica et Semitica Theodoro Christiano Vriezen Dedicata*, ed. W. C. van Unnik and A. S. van der Woude, Wageningen: H. Veenman & Zonen, 1966, pp. 100-107.

Frost, S. B., *Old Testament Apocalyptic: Its Origin and Growth*, London: Epworth Press, 1952.

Fuss, W., "II Samuel 24," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LXXIV (1962), 145-164.

Gaster, T. H., *Thespis: Ritual, Myth and Drama in the Ancient Near East*, New York: Henry Schuman, 1950.

Ginsberg, H. L., "A Phoenician Hymn in the Psalter," *Atti del XIX Congresso Internazionale degli Orientalisti*, Roma, 1935, pp. 472-476.

Gold, V. R., "Kiriath-jearim," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, III (1962), 37-38.

Good, E. M., "Joshua, Book of," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, II (1962), 988-995.

Gordon, C. H., "^{c}Almah in Isaiah 7:14," *Journal of Bible and Religion*, XXI (1953), 106.

Gottwald, N. K., *Studies in the Book of Lamentations* (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 14), rev. ed., London: SCM Press, 1962.

Gray, G. B., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah*, Vol. I: *Introduction and Commentary on I-XXVII* (The International Critical Commentary), Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912.

Gray, J., "Ashtoreth," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, I (1962), 255-256.

Gray, J., "Chemosh," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, I (1962), 556.

Gray, J., *I & II Kings: A Commentary*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.

Gray, J., "Molech, Moloch," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, III (1962), 422-423.

Gray, J., "Shahar," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, IV (1962), 303.

Gray, J., "Shalem (God)," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, IV (1962), 303-304.

Gressmann, H., *Der Messias*, ed. H. Schmidt (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Bd. 43), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1929.

Gunkel, H., *Genesis übersetzt und erklärt* (Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, I. Abteilung, Bd. 1), 3. Aufl., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.

Gunkel, H., *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895.

Hahn, H. F., *The Old Testament in Modern Research*, London: SCM Press, 1956.

Haran, M., "The Ark and the Cherubim: Their Symbolic Significance in Biblical Ritual," *Israel Exploration Journal*, IX (1959), 30-38, 89-94.

Haran, M., "Shiloh and Jerusalem: The Origin of the Priestly Tradition in the Pentateuch," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXI (1962), 14-24.

Harrelson, W., *Interpreting the Old Testament*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Harrelson, W., "Nonroyal Motifs in the Royal Eschatology," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962, pp. 147-165.

Hayes, J. H., "The Tradition of Zion's Inviolability," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXII (1963), 419-426.

Hermisson, H. J., *Sprache und Ritus im altisraelitischen Kult* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten Testament, Bd. 19), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1965.

Herrmann, J., "*hilastērion*," §1. "*hilastērion = kappōret*," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, III, ed. G. Kittel (1938), 319-320.

Herrmann, S., "Die Königsnovelle in Ägypten und in Israel: Ein Beitrag zur Gattungsgeschichte in den Geschichtsbüchern des Alten Testaments," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig, Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*, 3. Jahrgang (1953-54), Heft I, pp. 51-62.

Hertzberg, H. W., "Die Melchisedek-Traditionen" (1928), *Beiträge zur Traditionsgeschichte und Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962, pp. 36-44.

Hertzberg, H. W., *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, tr. J. S. Bowden, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.

Hillars, D. R., "Ritual Procession of the Ark and Ps 132," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XXX (1968), 48-55.

Hollis, F. J., "The Sun-cult and the Temple at Jerusalem," *Myth and Ritual: The Myth and Ritual Patterns of the Ancient East*, ed. S. H. Hooke, London: Oxford University Press, 1933, pp. 87-110.

Huffmon, H. B., "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXVIII (1959), 285-295.

Humbert, P., "'Qânâ' en Hébreu biblique," *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. W. Baumgartner *et al.*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1950, pp. 259-266.

Hyatt, J. P., "The Book of Jeremiah: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, Vol. V, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956, pp. 775-1142.

Hyatt, J. P., "Zephaniah," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962, pp. 640-642.

Jackson, J. J., "Deep, The," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, I (1962), 813-814.

Jacob, E., *Theology of the Old Testament*, tr. A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1955.

Jenni, E., "Day of the Lord," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, I (1962), 784-785.

Jeremias, Jörg, *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, Bd. 10), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1965.

Johnson, A. R., *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel*, 2d ed., Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1962.

Johnson, A. R., "The Psalms," *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. H. H. Rowley, London: Oxford University Press, 1951, pp. 162-209.

Johnson, A. R., *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1955.

Joines, K. R., "Winged Serpents in Isaiah's Inaugural Vision," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXVI (1967), 410-415.

Jones, D. R., *Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi* (Torch Bible Commentaries), London: SCM Press, 1962.

Jones, D. R., "Isaiah--II and III," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962, pp. 516-536.

Jones, D. R., *Isaiah 56-66 and Joel* (Torch Bible Commentaries), London: SCM Press, 1964.

Kaiser, O., *Der Prophet Jesaja: Kapitel 1-12* (Das Alte Testament Deutsch, Bd. 17), 2. Aufl., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.

Kapelrud, A. S., *Joel Studies* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1948:4), Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1948.

Kapelrud, A. S., *The Ras Shamra Discoveries and the Old Testament*, tr. G. W. Anderson, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.

Kenyon, K. M., "Excavations in Jerusalem 1961-1963," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, XXVII (1964), 34-52.

Key, A. F., "The Magical Background of Isaiah 6:9-13," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXVI (1967), 198-204.

Kissane, E. J., *The Book of Isaiah*, Vol. I, Dublin: The Richview Press, 1941.

Koehler, L., *Old Testament Theology*, tr. A. S. Todd, London: Lutterworth Press, 1957.

Kraeling, E. G., *The Old Testament Since the Reformation*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955.

Kraft, C. F., "Jashar, Book of," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, II (1962), 803.

Kraus, H. J., *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart*, Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1956.

Kraus, H. J., "Gilgal--Eine Beitrag zur Kultusgeschichte Israels," *Vetus Testamentum*, I (1951), 181-199.

Kraus, H. J., *Klagelieder* (Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament, Bd. 20), 2. Aufl., Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1960.

Kraus, H. J., *Die Königsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament: Untersuchungen zu den Liedern von Jahwes Thronbesteigung* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, Bd. 13), Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1951.

Kraus, H. J., *Prophetie und Politik* (Theologische Existenz Heute, Neue Folge, Bd. 36), München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1952.

Kraus, H. J., *Die prophetische Verkündigung des Rechts in Israel* (Theologische Studien, Bd. 51), Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1957.

Kraus, H. J., *Psalmen* (Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament, Bd. 15), 2 Bde., 2. Aufl., Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1961.

Kraus, H. J., *Worship in Israel: A Cultic History of the Old Testament*, tr. G. Buswell, Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966.

Krauss, S., "Zion and Jerusalem, A Linguistic and Historical Study," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, LXXVII (1945), 15-33.

Lacheman, E. R., "Apropos of Isaiah 7:14," *Journal of Bible and Religion*, XXII (1953), 43.

van der Leeuw, G., *Religion in Essence and Manifestation*, tr. J. E. Turner, Vol. II, New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

Leslie, E. A., *Jeremiah Chronologically Arranged, Translated and Interpreted*, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954.

Leslie, E. A., *The Psalms: Translated and Interpreted in the Light of Hebrew Life and Worship*, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1949.

Levi Della Vida, G., "El ᶜElyon in Genesis 14:18-20," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXIII (1944), 1-9.

Lewy, J., "Les textes paléo-assyriens et l'Ancien Testament," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, CX (1934), 29-65.

Lewy, J., "The Šulmān Temple in Jerusalem," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLIX (1940), 519-522.

Lindblom, J., *Prophecy in Ancient Israel*, Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1962.

Lipinski, E., *La royauté de Yahwé dans la poésie et le culte de l'ancien Israël* (Verhandelingen van de Kininklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België, Klasse der letteren, Jaargang XXVII, Nr. 55), Brussel: Paleis der Acadamiën, 1965.

Lohse, E., "*Siōn, Ierousalēm, Hierosolyma, Hierosolymitēs*," §§B-D, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, VII, ed. G. Friedrich (1964), 318-338.

McKenzie, J. L., "Mythological Allusions in Ezek 28:12-18," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXV (1956), 322-327.

MacLean, H. B., "Hezekiah," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, II (1962), 598-600.

MacLean, H. B., "Manasseh," §2. "King of Judah," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, III (1962), 254-255.

Marsh, J., *Amos and Micah* (Torch Bible Commentaries), London: SCM Press, 1959.

Marsh, J., "The Book of Numbers: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, Vol. II, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953, pp. 135-308.

Mauchline, J., "I and II Kings," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. Rowley, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962, pp. 338-356.

May, H. G., "The Book of Ezekiel: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, Vol. VI, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956, pp. 39-338.

May, H. G., "Joshua," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962, pp. 289-303.

May, H. G., "The King in the Garden of Eden: A Study of Ezekiel 28:12-19," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962, pp. 166-176.

May, H. G., "Some Aspects of Solar Worship at Jerusalem," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LV (1937), 269-281.

Meek, T. J., "The Book of Lamentations: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, Vol. VI, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956, pp. 1-38.

Miller, P. D. Jr., "El the Warrior," *Harvard Theological Review* LX (1967), 411-431.

Montgomery, J. A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings*, ed. H. S. Gehman (The International Critical Commentary), Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1951.

Morgenstern, J., *The Ark, the Ephod, and the "Tent of Meeting,"* Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1945.

Morgenstern, J., *The Fire upon the Altar*, Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1963.

Morgenstern, J., "New Year," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, III (1962), 544-546.

Mowinckel, S., *Der achtundsechzigste Psalm* (Avhandlinger utgitt av Det Norske Videnkaps-Akademi i Oslo, II, Hist.-Filos. Klasse 1953, No. 1), Oslo: Dybwad, 1953.

Mowinckel, S., *He That Cometh*, tr. G. W. Anderson, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954.

Mowinckel, S., *Prophecy and Tradition: The Prophetic Books in the Light of the Study of the Growth and History of the Tradition* (Avhandlinger utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, II, Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1946, No. 3), Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1946.

Mowinckel, S., *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, tr. D. R. Ap-Thomas, 2 vols., Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Muilenburg, J., "The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 40-66: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, Vol. V, Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1956, pp. 381-773.

Muilenburg, J., "Ezekiel," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962, pp. 568-590.

Muilenburg, J., "A Liturgy of the Triumphs of Yahweh," *Studia Biblica et Semitica Theodoro Christiano Vriezen Dedicata*, ed. W. C. van Unnik and A. S. van der Woude, Wageningen: H. Veenman & Zonen, 1966, pp. 233-251.

Müller, W. E., *Die Vorstellung vom Rest im Alten Testament*, Borsdorf-Leipzig: Hoppe, 1939.

Myers, J. M., "The Book of Judges: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, Vol. II, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953, pp. 675-826.

Myers, J. M., *Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah* (The Layman's Bible Commentary, Vol. 14), Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959.

Neil, W., "Joel, Book of," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, III (1962), 926-929.

Newman, M., "The Prophetic Call of Samuel," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962, pp. 86-97.

North, C. R., "Ariel," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, I (1962), 218.

North, C. R., "Immanuel," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, II (1962), 685-688.

North, C. R., "Isaiah," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, II (1962), 731-744.

North, C. R., *The Second Isaiah: Introduction, Translation and Commentary to Chapters XL-LV*, London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Noth, M., *Das Buch Josua* (Handbuch zum Alten Testament, I. Reihe, Bd. 7), 2. Aufl., Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953.

Noth, M., "David und Israel in 2. Samuel 7" (1957), *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, 2. Aufl., München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1960, pp. 334-345.

Noth, M., *Exodus: A Commentary*, tr. J. S. Bowden, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962.

Noth, M., *Die Gesetze im Pentateuch* (1940), reprinted in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, 2. Aufl., München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1960, pp. 9-141.

Noth, M., "Gott, König, Volk im Alten Testament" (1950), *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, 2. Aufl., München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1960, pp. 188-229.

Noth, M., *The History of Israel*, tr. S. Godman, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1958.

Noth, M., "Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition" (1950), *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, 2. Aufl., München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1960, pp. 172-187.

Noth, M., *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels* (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, IV. Folge, Heft 1), Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1930.

Noth, M., *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, 2. Aufl., Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1948.

Noth, M., *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament*, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1943.

Nyberg, H. S., "Studien zum Religionskampf im Alten Testament," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, XXXV (1938), 329-387.

Oesterley, W. O. E., *The Psalms: Translated with Text-Critical and Exegetical Notes*, London: S.P.C.K., 1939.

Oppenheim, A. L., "Sennacherib," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, IV (1962), 270-272.

Paterson, J., "Jeremiah," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962, pp. 537-562.

Pedersen, J., *Israel: Its Life and Culture*, 4 vols. in 2, Copenhagen: Branner og Korch, 1926-1940.

Pfeiffer, R. H., *Introduction to the Old Testament*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941.

Pope, M. H., "Devoted," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, I (1962), 838-839.

Pope, M. H., *El in the Ugaritic Texts* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, Vol. 2), Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955.

Porteous, N. W., "Jerusalem-Zion: the Growth of a Symbol," *Verbannung und Heimkehr: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie Israels im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Wilhelm Rudolph zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht*, ed. A. Kuschke, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1961, pp. 235-252.

Porteous, N. W., "The Prophets and the Problem of Continuity," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962, pp. 11-25.

Porteous, N. W., "Shalem-Shalom," *Glasgow University Oriental Society Transactions*, X (1940-41), 1-7.

Press, R., "Der Prophet Samuel," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LVI (1938), 177-225.

Procksch, O., *Jesaia I* (Kommentar zum Alten Testament, Bd. 9), Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1930.

von Rad, G., "Der Anfang der Geschichtsschreibung im alten Israel" (1944), *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1958, pp. 148-188.

von Rad, G., "Deuteronomy," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, I (1962), 831-838.

von Rad, G., *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*, tr. D. Barton, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966.

von Rad, G., "Es ist noch eine Ruhe vorhanden dem Volke Gottes" (1933), *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1958, pp. 101-108.

von Rad, G., *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch* (1938), reprinted in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1958, pp. 9-86.

von Rad, G., *Genesis: A Commentary*, tr. J. H. Marks, London: SCM Press, 1961.

von Rad, G., *Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel*, 3. Aufl., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958.

von Rad, G., "Das judäische Königsritual" (1947), *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1958, pp. 205-213.

von Rad, G., *Old Testament Theology*, tr. D. M. G. Stalker, 2 vols., Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1962-1965.

von Rad, G., "The Origin of the Concept of the Day of Yahweh," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, IV (1959), 97-108.

von Rad, G., "Die Stadt auf dem Berge" (1949), *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1958, pp. 214-224.

von Rad, G., *Studies in Deuteronomy*, tr. D. Stalker (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 9), Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953.

von Rad, G., "Zelt und Lade" (1931), *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1958, pp. 476-498.

Rendtorff, R., "El, Ba^{c}al und Jahwe," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LXXVIII (1966), 277-291.

Ringgren, H., *Israelite Religion*, tr. D. E. Green, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

Rist, M., "Apocalypticism," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, I (1962), 157-161.

Robinson, H. W., *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament*, London: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Robinson, T. H., *A History of Israel*, Vol. I: *From the Exodus to the Fall of Jerusalem, 586 B. C.*, London: Oxford University Press, 1932.

Robinson, T. H., and Horst, F., *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten* (Handbuch zum Alten Testament, I. Reihe, Bd. 14), 2. Aufl., Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1954.

Rohland, E., *Die Bedeutung der Erwählungstraditionen Israels für die Eschatologie der altestamentlichen Propheten*, Heidelberg dissertation, 1956.

Rost, L., *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids* (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, III. Folge, Heft 6), Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1926.

Rowley, H. H., "Melchizedek and Zadok (Gen 14 and Ps 110)," *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. W. Baumgartner *et al.*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1950, pp. 461-472.

Rowley, H. H., "The Prophet Jeremiah and the Book of Deuteronomy," *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy: Presented to Professor Theodore H. Robinson*, ed. H. H. Rowley, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950, pp. 157-174.

Rowley, H. H., *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 2d ed., London: Lutterworth Press, 1947.

Rowley, H. H., "Zadok and Nehushtan," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LVIII (1939), 113-141.

Rylaarsdam, J. C., "The Book of Exodus: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, Vol. I, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1952, pp. 831-1099.

Saebø, M., "Formgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu Jesaja 7:3-9," *Studia Theologica*, XIV (1960), 54-69.

Scharff, A., and Moortgat, A., *Ägypten und Vorderasien im Altertum*, München: Verlag F. Bruckmann, 1950.

Schmid, H., "Jahwe und die Kulttraditionen von Jerusalem," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LXVII (1955), 168-197.

Schmidt, H., *Der heilige Fels in Jerusalem*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1933.

Schmidt, K. L., "Jerusalem als Urbild und Abbild," *Eranos-Jahrbuch*, XVIII (1950), 207-248.

Schmidt, W., *Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel: zur Herkunft der Königsprädikation Jahwes* (Beiträge zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Bd. 80), Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1961.

Schmökel, H., *Heilige Hochzeit und Hoheslied*, Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1956.

Schreiner, J., *Sion-Jerusalem Jahwes Königssitz: Theologie der Heiligen Stadt im Alten Testament* (Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, Bd. 7), München: Kösel-Verlag, 1963.

Schumacher, F. T., "Ahijah," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, I (1962), 67-68.

Scott, R. B. Y., "The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 1-39: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, Vol. V, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956, pp. 149-381.

Scott, R. B. Y., "Jachin and Boaz," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, II (1962), 780-781.

Scott, R. B. Y., "The Literary Structure of Isaiah's Oracles," *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy: Presented to Professor Theodore H. Robinson*, ed. H. H. Rowley, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950, pp. 175-186.

Scott, R. B. Y., "The Pillars Jachin and Boaz," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LVIII (1939), 143-149.

Scott, R. B. Y., *The Relevance of the Prophets*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944.

Simon, J., *Jerusalem in the Old Testament: Researches and Theories*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1952.

Simpson, C. A., "The Growth of the Hexateuch," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, Vol. I, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1952, pp. 185-200.

Skinner, J., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis* (The International Critical Commentary), 2d ed., Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1930.

Skinner, J., *Prophecy and Religion: Studies in the Life of Jeremiah*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922.

Smend, R., *Jahwekrieg und Stämmebund: Erwägungen zur ältesten Geschichte Israels* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Bd. 84), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.

Smith, H. P., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (The International Critical Commentary), Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899.

Snaith, N. H., "The First and Second Books of Kings: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, Vol. III, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954, pp. 1-338.

Snaith, N. H., "Numbers," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962, pp. 254-268.

Stalker, D. M. G., "Exodus," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962, pp. 208-240.

Stoebe, H. J., "Die Einnahme Jerusalems und die Ṣinnôr," *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, LXXII (1957), 73-99.

Szikszai, S., "King, Kingship," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, III (1962), 11-17.

Szikszai, S., "Samuel, I and II," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, IV (1962), 202-209.

Thomas, D. W., "Micah," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962, pp. 630-634.

Thompson, J. A., "The Book of Joel: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, Vol. VI, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956, pp. 727-760.

Toombs, L. E., "War, Ideas of," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, IV (1962), 796-801.

Torczyner, N. H., *Die Bundeslade und die Anfänge der Religion Israels*, 2. Aufl., Berlin: Philo Verlag, 1930.

de Vaux, R., *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, tr. J. McHugh, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

de Vaux, R., "Les chérubins et l'arche d'alliance: Les sphinx gardiens et les trônes divins dans l'ancien Orient," *Mélanges de l'université Saint Joseph*, XXXVII (1961), 91-124.

Vincent, L. H., and Steve, A. M., *Jérusalem de l'Ancien Testament*, 3 vols. in 2, Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1954-1956.

Vischer, W., *Die Immanuel-Botschaft im Rahmen des königlichen Zionsfestes* (Theologische Studien, Bd. 45), Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1955.

Volz, P., *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1934.

Vriezen, T. C., "Essentials of the Theology of Isaiah," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962, pp. 128-146.

Weber, M., *Ancient Judaism*, tr. H. H. Gerth and D. Martindale, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1952.

Weiser, A., *Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten*, I: *Die Propheten Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona, Micha* (Das Alte Testament Deutsch, Bd. 24), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949.

Weiser, A., *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development*, tr. D. M. Barton, New York: Association Press, 1961.

Weiser, A., "*Pisteuō, pistis, pistos, pistoō, apistos, apisteō, apistia, oligopistos, oligopistia*," §B. "Der at.liche Begriff," *Theologisches Worterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Bd. VI, ed. G. Friedrich (1959), pp. 182-197.

Weiser, A., *The Psalms: A Commentary*, tr. H. Hartwell, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962.

Weiser, A., "Zur Frage nach den Beziehungen der Psalmen zum Kult: die Darstellung der Theophanie in den Psalmen und im Festkult" (1950), *Glaube und Geschichte im Alten Testament und andere ausgewählte Schriften*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961, pp. 303-321.

Wellhausen, J., *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, New York: Meridian Books, 1957.

Wensinck, A. J., *The Ideas of the Western Semites Concerning the Navel of the Earth* (Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afdeeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel XVII, No. 1), Amsterdam: Johannes Müller, 1916.

Westermann, C., *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*, tr. H. C. White, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.

Westermann, C., *Das Buch Jesaja: Kapitel 40-66* (Das Alte Testament Deutsch, Bd. 19), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

Whitley, C. F., *The Exilic Age*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957.

Wildberger, H., *Jesaja* (Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament, Bd. 10), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1965ff.

Wildberger, H., "Die Völkerwallfahrt zum Zion: Jes. II 1-5," *Vetus Testamentum*, VII (1957), 62-81.

Wolfe, R. E., "The Book of Micah: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, Vol. VI, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956, pp. 895-949.

Wolff, H. W., *Dodekapropheten: Joel* (Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament, Bd. 14:5), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1963.

Wolff, H. W., *Frieden ohne Ende: Eine Auslegung von Jes. 7:1-17 und 9:1-6* (Biblische Studien, Bd. 35), Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1962.

Wolff, H. W., "Hoseas geistige Heimat," *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, LXXXI (1956), 83-94.

Wright, G. E., *Biblical Archaeology*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957.

Wright, G. E., "The Book of Deuteronomy: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick, Vol. II, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953, pp. 309-537.

Wright, G. E., *The Book of Isaiah* (The Layman's Bible Commentary, Vol. 11), Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964).

Wright, G. E., "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962, pp. 26-67.

Wright, G. E., and Filson, F. V., *The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible*, rev. ed., Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956.

Würthwein, E., "Jesaja 7:1-9: Ein Beitrag zum Thema Prophetie und Politik," *Theologie als Glaubenswagnis: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Karl Heim*, Hamburg: Furche-Verlag, 1954, pp. 47-63.

Würthwein, E., "Der Ursprung der prophetischen Gerichtsrede," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, XLIX (1952), 1-16.

Ziegler, J., "Die Hilfe Gottes 'am Morgen'," *Bonner Biblische Beiträge*, Bd. I: *Alttestamentliche Studien, Friedrich Nötscher zum Sechzigsten Geburtstag*, ed. H. Junker und J. Botterweck, Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1950, pp. 281-288.

ABSTRACT

Comparative studies showed long ago that, during the period of the Judean monarchy, mythical and cosmological themes of Canaanite-Jebusite background were associated with Zion in the Jerusalem cult tradition. More recent studies have connected the transferral of the ark to Zion with the twin themes of Yahweh's election of Zion and the Davidic dynasty as cultic traditions analogous to the *heilsgeschichtlich* themes of the Pentateuch. But the relation between these two sources of Zion symbolism has not been explained satisfactorily. The basis of the so-called doctrine of the inviolability of Zion has also remained obscure.

The unifying hypothesis of the dissertation has been that the symbolism of Zion developed from themes associated with the ark at the beginning of the monarchy in continuity with Shiloh cult traditions. The ark, together with the cherubim and the divine title Yahweh Sabaoth, symbolized Yahweh's holy war action on behalf of Israel pictured in storm theophany imagery of partially Canaanite background. The ark also symbolized Yahweh leading Israel from Sinai to Canaan by a series of holy war victories. Thus its transferral to Zion made Zion the goal of the *Heilsgeschichte* and the focus of Yahweh's holy war theophany intervention.

Beginning in the time of David the ark cult came to represent the holy war power of Yahweh bestowing imperial dominion upon the king from Zion. Canaanite El Elyon mythological themes appropriated from the Jebusites glorified Yahweh as high god enthroned over the cosmos. Zion as Yahweh's holy mountain and the place of the ark and cherubim became the earthly representation of Yahweh's cosmic enthronement and kingship. The old holy war symbolism of the ark was enhanced by cosmic conflict themes of Canaanite origin making Zion a symbol of cosmic stability and

of Yahweh's holy war protection.

Isaiah reinterpreted this traditional symbolism in a radical way demanding that the king trust Yahweh for holy war deliverance, abandoning trust in military power and political alliances. He also used the traditional holy war imagery associated with Zion as the basis for threats of divine punishment against Jerusalem. But, in the face of Sennacherib's arrogant mockery of Yahweh's power, he promised deliverance for Zion on the basis of the Zion holy war theophany tradition.

During the last century of the Judean monarchy the traditional symbolism of Zion partially disintegrated in the face of Assyrian domination and the subsequent Deuteronomic reform based mainly on non-Zion traditions. Contributing to this disintegration Micah and Jeremiah announced Yahweh's destruction of Zion as a symbol of false and illusory security. After the fall of Jerusalem this view was widely accepted.

Zion remained alive as a symbol of hope and deliverance primarily among the Isaianic school of traditionists, especially Deutero-Isaiah, and became the basis of a restoration theology envisioning a new theophany revelation centering at Zion which would end the exile and bring a pilgrimage of the nations to Zion to acknowledge Yahweh. In the later postexilic period day-of-Yahweh themes were assimilated to this eschatology of hope producing a complex eschatology in which Yahweh's holy war theophany intervention delivers Zion from an attacking horde of nations and from cosmic collapse. Thus the old vertical typology in which Zion symbolized a changeless cosmic order and a corresponding stability of the Judean political order was replaced by an eschatological typology in which Zion symbolized the possibility of hoping and trusting in Yahweh in the face of the inescapable insecurity of human history.